

CLASSICAL JOURNAL

FOR

SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1822.

VOL. XXVI.

ὦ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
 Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ρίψον ἅ μὴ νοέεις.

EPIGR. INCERT.

T he Hebrew Bible. By	03
.....	
's Edition of <i>Philemon</i> .	
.....	67
London:	
entateuch, by Eichhorn,	
PRINTED BY, D. G. WAIT	73
RED LION DO	78
SOLD the Levant; by WILLIAM	
.....	82
LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORM	
J. BIVINGTONS; SHEPWOOD	
.....	
ROW; PARKER, OXFORD, M.D.	89
BRIDGE; MASON	
.....	
BURGH; CUMMI	
ALL OTHER	
.....	
gal, in 1820, and translated	

ERRATA.

No. XLVII. P. 56. note, after the word '*Homer*,' add, in this form. See *Iliad. lib. xiv. l. 203, 204.*

- XLIX. Page 8. line 12. for *riches* read *ruins*
 12. 4. for *Agenores* read *Agenoreo*
 13. for *Lusiadum* read *Luciaddm*
 14. 8. for ξυγατρῶν read ξυγατρῶν
 31. 18. for תידג read חיוג
 32. 5. for קשדד read קטון
 19. for לשע read ליעג
 for בשנת read בשנת
 124. 14. for *visit* read *risit*
 125. 8. for *permiscent* read *permisceat*
 33. for *alterius* read *ulterius*
 35. for *certatim* read *certatum*.

The Numbers are always regularly published on the first of April, July, October, and January. Subscribers may, therefore, have them *id* *Magazines, by giving a general*
orr'

now be had of all the Booksellers.

month at least before the day
er, Red Lion Court, Fleet

CONTENTS OF NO. LI.

	PAGE.
Notice of The Satires of Aulus Persius Flaccus, translated into English Verse; by W. GIFFORD, Esq.	1
The Arithmetic of the Holy Scriptures. No. II.	13
Latin Poem:— <i>Athenarum Panorama, seu Græciæ Veteris Encomium</i> . By P. AUG. LEMAIRE	17
Collation of the Sept. c. Thebas of Æschylus with a MS. in the Library at Turin. By AMADEUS PEYRON	25
Observations on some of the Notes in the late Mr. DALZEL's <i>Collectanea Græca Majora</i> . By the Rev. J. SEAGER. No. II.	27
An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology. Part VII. By R. P. KNIGHT	33
Defence of Plagiarism	51
Symbolæ Criticæ ad Ciceronis Disputationum Tusculanarum, Lib. I. A CAROLO MORGENSTERN	56
On the Various Readings of the Hebrew Bible. By KIMCHI	63
Critical Remarks on Dr. OSANN's Edition of <i>Philemon</i> . No. II. By E. H. BARKER	67
Remarks on Criticisms of the Pentateuch, by Eichhorn, Bertholdt, &c. By the Rev. D. G. WAIT	73
Nugæ, No. IV.	78
Notice of Journal of a Tour in the Levant; by WILLIAM TURNER, Esq.	82
An Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology; to which is added, A Critical Examination of the remains of Egyptian Chronology. By J. C. PRICHARD, M.D.	89
Notice of Itinerary of El Hage Boubeker Anzani, an African, from Seno-Palel in Senegal to Mekka; published at Fort-Louis, Senegal, in 1820, and translated	

from the Arabic, by M. P. ROUZÉE. Translated from the French by J. G. JACKSON	100
Notice of <i>Idyllia Heroica Decem, Librum Phaleuciorum Unum, partim jam primo partim iterum atque tertio edit SAVAGIUS LANDOR. Accedit Quæstiancula cur poëtæ Latini recentiores minus legantur. Pisis, 1820</i>	105
Oriental Criticism. By GULCHIN	113
Plato, Horatius, et Alcæus, emendati. A G. B.	122
Remarks on Mr. Bellamy's New Translation of the Old Testament	125
Oxford Latin Prize Poem, for 1822 :— <i>Alpes ab Annibale superata</i> . By F. CURZON	132
Oxford Latin Prize Essay, for 1822 :— <i>An re verâ pravaverit apud eruditiores antiquorum Polytheismus</i> . By J. B. OTTLEY	137
Reply of ΒΟΙΝΤΟΣ to E. H. BARKER	147
Notice of the Pamphlets of <i>Eubulus</i> and <i>Philograntus</i> , lately published, relative to the Studies and Examinations at Cambridge	148
E. H. BARKERI <i>Amœnitates Criticæ et Philologicæ. No. III.</i> :— <i>De Adv. desinentibus in ēi et i.</i> — <i>De Particula Nη: de Adj. Nηδής: de Alcman. et Callim. Fragmm.</i> — <i>On the Pronunciation of the Greek Language</i>	158
Remarks on the Examination of the Primary Argument of the <i>Iliad</i> ; and on the History of the <i>Æolic Digamma</i> . By GRANVILLE PENN, Esq.	168
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA, No. XXX.—Verses by Lord Carlisle; to Lady Holland, on the Snuff-box bequeathed to her by Bonaparte: Idem Græce redditum—Arcadian <i>Asætes</i> —Cumulus— <i>Eis μνήμην Ἐρρίκίεττης Ταππαρέλλης</i> : Idem Latine redditum—Th. Valpergæ Ode ad Fortunam; Epigramma; Epitaphium—Gilbert Wakefield ..	188
Chronological Mnemonics	196
Classical Criticism	198
Literary Intelligence	199
To Correspondents	204

CONTENTS OF NO. LII.

	PAGE.
Notice of <i>The Spirit of the Gospel, or the Four Evangelists Elucidated by Explanatory Observations, Historical References, and Miscellaneous Illustrations</i> ; by the Rev. W. S. GILLY, A. M.	209
Notice of <i>Idyllia Heroica Decem, Librum Phaleuciorum Unum, partim jam primo partim iterum atque tertium edit</i> SAVAGIUS LANDOR. <i>Accedit Quæstiuncula cur poetæ Latini recentiores minus legantur.</i> Pisis, MDCCCXX.	217
On two passages in Virgil's <i>Georgics</i>	232
In <i>Demosthenem</i> Commentarii JOANNIS SEAGER, A.M.	238
Symbolæ Criticæ in quædam Loca <i>Platonis et Horatii</i> . CAROLUS MORGENSTERN	239
Biblical Criticism	245
Observations on that part of a work, intituled <i>Empedoclis et Parmenidis Fragmenta ex codice Taurinensis Bibliothecæ restituta et illustrata, ab AMEDEO PEYRON, Lipsiæ, 1810</i> , in which the author treats of the genuine Greek text of the Commentary of <i>Simplicius in Aristotelem de Cælo et Mundo</i>	250
An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology. Part VIII. By R. P. KNIGHT	259
Oxford English Prize Essay, for 1822:— <i>The Study of Moral Evidence.</i> W. A. SHIRLEY	280
Cambridge English Prize Poem, for 1822:— <i>Palmyra.</i> J. H. BRIGHT	300
Criseos Mythologicæ Specimen. C. O. MULLER	308
Notice of <i>Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco Libri Octo. Ad optimorum Codicum fidem, adhibitis doctorum virorum observationibus, recensuit, Summariis et Notis illustravit, Indicesque Rerum et Verborum adjecit</i> , CH. F. F. HAACKIUS, Vol. I. II. <i>Lipsiæ, Hahn</i>	318
On the Orations ascribed to Cicero.—Notice of <i>M. Manilii Astronomicon Libri Quinque. Cum Commentariis et Castigationibus Josephi Scaligeri, J. A. Caesaris Scal. Fil. S. Junii Biturigis, et Fayi; his accedunt Bentleii Quædam Animadversiones reprehensione dignæ; quibus omnibus Editor sua Scholæ interposuit. Opera et Studio EDMUNDI BURTON, Arm. A. M. S. Trin.</i>	

	PAGE.
<i>Coll. Cantab. aliquando Socii. Londini, 1783. [Extracted from the London Magazine, 1785.]</i>	321
Itinerary of Achmed ben El Hassen, from Fas to Tafilelt; translated, with explanatory notes, by J. G. JACKSON	329
Remarks on Mr. Bellamy's New Translation of the Old Testament. By J. WILLIAMS	335
Comicorum Græcorum Fragmenta; specimen editionis a G. BURGES. No. II.	346
Remarks on Livy iii. 5.	352
Prolusio Epigraphica de Inscriptione Græca in Museo Britannico asservata, Auctore FRID. OSANN, Professore Jenensi	358
Nugæ, No. v. By ΒΟΙΝΤΟΣ	368
In Euripidei Phaethontis Fragmenta Notæ. G. B.	366
Notice of <i>Decimi J. Juvenalis et A. Persii Flacci Satiræ: ex Edd. Ruperti et Kœnig, expurgatæ. Accedunt, in gratiam Juventutis, Notæ quadam Anglice scriptæ</i>	374
Biblical Criticism	376
Classical Criticism	378
Phœnician Antiquities and Oriental Geography	381
Biblical Criticism	386
On the inseparable Negative Particle <i>μη</i>	390
Greek Inscriptions. By COL. LEAKE	393
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA, No. XXXI.—Classical Criticism—Epigrammata, Epitaphia, variorum, No. III. &c.	396
On the Ancient Division of the Universe; by R. NARES	402
Notice of <i>Considerations on the Nature and Tendency of Classical Literature, with Remarks on the Discipline in the Grammar School at Bradford, York.</i> By the Rev. S. SLACK, Head Master	404
Specimen Characteris Codicis Ambrosiani	40
Literary Intelligence	40
To Correspondents	40

ERRATA IN NO. LI.

Page 14. line 6. for שני read שני
 16. 32. 5070 50.070.



THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Nº. LI.

SEPTEMBER, 1822.

NOTICE OF

*The SATIRES of AULUS PERSIUS FLACCUS,
translated into English Verse. By W. GIFFORD,
Esq. With Notes and Illustrations, and the Latin
Text. London, Murray.*

THERE is perhaps no Latin poet, of whom it would be more difficult to give a translation at once faithful to the original, and acceptable to the English reader, than Persius. Even in his own language, it must be confessed, he is not the most inviting of Roman writers; and in rendering the satirical poetry of another country, it is impossible, from the diversity of national manners, to preserve the full force of many of the local allusions which lie thickly scattered throughout such compositions, and not least so in our author; not to mention, that in the case of an ancient writer, many of these allusions must necessarily have become obscure or unintelligible. Another cause of failure is the incongruity of our modern phrases and appellations with the ideas which, in such a translation, they are intended to convey. The language of sentiment and exalted passion is, to a great extent, the same in all ages and countries. The serious poet appeals to feelings and perceptions which have an existence, more or less, in every mind; and the words which he employs have, accordingly, their corresponding words in other languages, which may be substituted for them without any great loss of expressiveness. But the humorous writer, besides the general topics of ridicule which are common to all countries and states of society, addresses himself to such a multitude of local and temporary associations, that although with the help of a com-

ment it is frequently possible to translate his meaning, and even some portion of his spirit, into another language, yet the true point of the jest—the undefinable something, which constituted the peculiar zest of the passage, in the perceptions of contemporary readers, is gone. The body of wit remains, but the subtle essence is flown. Add to this the number of colloquial idioms, for which it is difficult to find substitutes in another language. Hence the obscurity of Aristophanes and the Roman satirists, when compared with the serious poets in both languages. And hence it is, that imitations of the above writers, in which the outline of the original, and the train of thought, are retained, with an adaptation of the allusions and incidents to modern times (such as those of Pope, Johnson, and the writer before us) have uniformly been more popular than translations of the original works. And when to the above disadvantages we add the defects of the poet himself, and of his subject; the little interest with which modern readers regard the events and characters of the age of Nero, compared with those of the republican times; the harshness and affected brevity of Persius' manner, which it is impossible entirely to disguise even in a translation; his abrupt transitions, and his want of artificial arrangement; it will not be thought surprising that Persius, though fortunate in many of his translators, has not acquired an extraordinary share of popularity.

Yet is Persius, to an intelligent reader, not without his interest. There is an inborn spirit of poetry showing itself amidst all his defects, like light struggling through clouds. As a portraiture of the manners of a distant age, and one of which scarce any other record remains, his writings will always command attention; and the air of earnestness and sincerity with which he promulgates his moral doctrines, as the present translator observes, although it may fail to convince, ensures our respect. Neither was the philosophical system which he adopted destitute of poetical capabilities. We are no admirers of the Stoical doctrine; neither are we insensible of its injurious practical tendency in more than one point of view. Stoicism was the fanaticism of philosophy; and while, on the one hand, the singular privileges it was supposed to confer generated pride in its professors, on the other, its extravagant requisitions and repulsive notions of virtue, may have reconciled some to vice, from a despair of ever attaining that perfect emancipation from moral evil, which the Porch demanded, as a *sine qua non*; an effect likewise produced by the puritanism of later times. Still there is, in the better parts of the system, an air of generosity and ele-

vation, well calculated to fascinate a young and poetical mind, like that of Persius. Its extravagances were but the distorted images of sublime truths. Such tenets are to philosophy what fabulous legends are to history. Truth indeed shines through them, but half concealed, and by imperfect glimpses; and it is in this dim light that poetry loves to reside. Nor ought we, in characterising Persius, to omit what is perhaps the most pleasing feature of his writings, the views which they occasionally afford us of his own personal disposition, of his warmth of heart, and sincerity of attachment.

Of the present translator's qualifications for his task we need say little. The translator of Juvenal, the first classical satirist of the age, the merciless castigator of the Della Cruscan fraternity, cannot be supposed deficient either in the talent or the disposition for satire. On the other hand, with few exceptions, there appears to be little in common, as to opinions or predilections, between Persius and his translator. Of the three classes into which satirists may be divided, the sarcastic, the indignant, and what for want of a better term we may call the Horatian, Mr. Gifford, we think, belongs to the first more than to either of the others. He bears more resemblance to Pope and Boileau than to any of the Roman satirists.

The translation is ushered in by a Preface, critical and biographical. Of the labors of his predecessors, Mr. Gifford speaks with a liberality of praise which is very exemplary. We shall extract part of his observations.

It cannot, I think, be affirmed, that a new translation of Persius is much wanted: we are already possessed of several; of various degrees of merit, indeed, but all exhibiting strong claims on the public favor. Brewster is familiar to every scholar. I had not looked into him since I left Exeter College; but the impression he then made on my mind was very powerful, and certainly of the most pleasing kind. I thought him, indeed, paraphrastic, unnecessarily minute in many unimportant passages, somewhat too familiar for his author, and occasionally ungraceful in his repetition of trivial words and phrases; but the general spirit, accuracy, and freedom of his version commanded my highest admiration,—which a recent perusal has not contributed, in any perceptible degree, to diminish. Dryden, of whom I should have spoken first, is beyond my praise. The majestic flow of his verse, the energy and beauty of particular passages, and the admirable purity and simplicity which pervade much of his language, place him above the hope of rivalry, and are better calculated to generate despair than to excite emulation.

But Dryden is sometimes negligent and sometimes unfaithful: he wanders with licentious foot, careless alike of his author and his reader; and seems to make a wanton sacrifice of his own learning. It is impossible to read a page of his translation without perceiving that he was intimately acquainted with the original; and yet every page betrays a disregard of its sense. By nature Dryden was eminently gifted for a

translator of Persius; he had much of his austerity of manner, and his closeness of reasoning—yet, by some unaccountable obliquity, he has missed those characteristic qualities, so habitual to him, and made the poet flippant and inconsequential.

I come now to Sir W. Drummond. This is a work of great elegance; spirited and poetical, and polished into a degree of smoothness seldom attained. But Sir William Drummond declares, that his object was 'rather to express his author's meaning clearly than to translate his words or to copy his manner servilely.' How he wishes these expressions to be understood, he has explained in a subsequent passage, which I shall take the liberty of laying before the reader.

'What Dryden judged too rude for imitation, the critics of the present day will probably think I have been prudent in not copying. I have generally, therefore, followed the outline; but I have *seldom* ventured to employ the colouring of Persius. When the coarse metaphor, or the extravagant hyperbole debases, or obscures the sense of the original, I have changed, or even omitted it; and where the idiom of the English language required it, I have thought myself justified in abandoning the literal sense of my author.' Pref. p. x.

I am somewhat inclined to suspect that Sir W. Drummond's opinion of the 'critics of the present day' is not altogether ill founded. In proportion, therefore, as he has gratified them, I shall be found to displease them; having freely encountered what he so sedulously avoided, and, with one or two exceptions merely, followed the original through all its coarseness and extravagance, and represented with equal fidelity, the outline, and the filling up, of the picture.¹

But, it will naturally be asked, if a new translation *be not much wanted*, why is the present intruded on the public? I am not one of those who think that the successful execution of a work should totally preclude every future attempt to rival or surpass it; for this would be to introduce an apathy and dejection fatal to all progressive excellence. The field of literature happily admits of various species of contention; and to excel in the humblest of them, is to possess some degree of merit, and to prefer some claim (however slight) to public favor. He who cannot attain the richness and harmony of Dryden, may yet hope to surpass him in fidelity; and though the spirit and freedom of Brewster may not be easily outgone, his conciseness and poetical feeling have not much to intimidate a competitor of ordinary endowments.

But to come closer to the question,—I endeavored (I know not with what success) to translate Persius as his immediate follower had been translated; I hoped that to a fidelity equal to that of the most scrupulous of my predecessors, I might be found to unite a certain degree of vigor, and to atone for a defect of poetical merit by conciseness and perspicuity. When I speak of fidelity, however, let it be observed, in justice to myself, that I carry the import of this word somewhat further than is usually done. I translate for the English reader, and do not think it sufficient to give him a loose idea of the original; but as fair and perfect a transcript

¹ Two other translations of Persius have appeared; but as they were not published before the present version was finished, they do not come under my judgment. I may add, however, that the last of the two, by Mr. Howes, is a work of singular merit. The other, which I have not
¹⁸ an fortunate enough to procure, is said to be a poor performance. 1817.

of it as the difference of language will admit: at the same time it will, I trust, appear that I have not, in any instance, fallen into barbarisms, or violated the idiom of my own country.

It will be readily admitted, that I have not adopted the most easy mode of translation; since, not content with giving the author's sense, I have entered as far as it was in my power, into his feelings, and exhibited as much of his manner, nay of his language, (i. e. his words,) as I possibly could. Expressions which have been usually avoided as not *germane* to our tongue, are here hazarded, for the simple purpose of bringing Persius, as he wrote, before the unlearned reader; who may be assured that he will find, in few versions, as much of the original as in the present:—for this, of course, he must take my affirmation;—nor is this all; for I have given him no more than the original: all that will be found here, is to be found in Persius.

The error here ascribed, by implication, to Sir W. Drummond, is one into which translators of modern times have been apt to fall, that of rendering a writer whose language is bold, and whose versification is free, in a style of ornamented and polished diction, and smooth and equable versification. A kindred error indeed pervades half the classical translations of the last and present century, from Pope's Homer to Hodgson's Juvenal, and Sir William's own Lucretius. If Mr. Gifford himself has now and then committed this error in the present version, it is on occasions where a contrary style of translating is the least requisite; as in the opening of the sixth Satire, and perhaps the address to Cornutus in the fifth. Dryden is well characterised in the above extract. What we have observed of Dryden's *Æneid* on a former occasion,¹ may be applied with greater or less justice to all his translations. They are not representatives of the original; but they are themselves originals, and excellent in their kind. At the expense of much of the characteristic beauty of the originals, he infuses a new manner and spirit of his own. We miss the sprightliness of Ovid, the lofty melodies of Virgil, the tessellated diction of Horace, the energetic simplicity of Lucretius, and the dignity of Juvenal; but we are repaid for them by an ease which, amidst much mistranslation, negligence, and coarseness, still delights, an all-pervading vivacity, a flow of happy language, and an exuberance of fancy which sometimes by its intrusion mars the beauty of the original, and sometimes comes in aid of its tameness.²

¹ No. ~~xxx~~ p. 288, in a review of Dr. Symmons's Translation of the *Æneid*.

² We recommend, to the readers of the Roman satirists, Dryden's Preface to his translations of Juvenal and Persius. The comparison between Juvenal and Horace, and indeed the whole of the latter part of the Introduction, is characterised by that union of critical acumen with liveliness of illustration, which renders Dryden's prefaces so delightful.

These remarks are followed by a well written view of the life and character of Persius, and a candid statement of his literary merits and defects. The obscurity so much complained of in his compositions Mr. Gifford attributes, partly to the intricacies of his doctrine, and his adoption of the vicious style of the masters of his school, and partly to the dramatic form in which much of his satire is couched.¹ His conciseness, indeed, whether natural to his genius, or borrowed from the Porch, renders his purport frequently indistinct. He never allows his thoughts full play; they are cooped up in too narrow a space, and become obscure by confinement, like the case of pent air, or the sullen heat of a furnace. Juvenal's indignation, on the contrary, moves with the breadth and sweep of a torrent, and like a torrent, clears away impediments before it. We agree with Mr. Gifford, however, in the observation (in which he is preceded by Owen) that the difficulties of Persius have been exaggerated.

Our scanty limits forbid us to expatiate further on the various topics touched on in the Preface. We shall content ourselves with recommending it to the attention of the reader. Among other interesting matter, it contains some observations, by the Rt. Hon. J. Hookham Frere, on the passage in Sat. v. (l. 22—24) beginning '*Verba togæ sequeris*,' and intended by Persius as a definition of his own style; from which we shall only extract the following:

The apparent confusion of metaphors in this passage is a strong proof that it consists of terms in familiar use; an analysis of our common discourse would exhibit an assemblage of the strangest and most incoherent images, which nevertheless pass unnoticed without ever shocking our taste or perplexing the fancy.

The fact is, that expressions metaphorical in their origin, by dint of uniform and constant use, cease at last to retain their metaphorical character, and remain in the general mass of language as simple signs to express those ideas which they were originally intended to illustrate.

¹ In this predilection for the dramatic manner of writing, Cowper resembles Persius. The introduction of the 'sage erudite' with nose 'terribly arched and aquiline,' in the 3d book of the *Task*, is in the spirit of the '*varicosi centuriones*,' &c. So also the apostrophe of Lothario, and the theological discussion in the poem of Hope. Another peculiarity of Cowper's is common to him with Juvenal—the starting off, on a sudden hint, to a new topic, and returning to the main subject at the interval of three or four lines. Thus in Juvenal's invective against Nero, Sat. VIII. he breaks out into the digressive questions, '*Quid enim Virginus armis*,' &c. For a parallel instance in Cowper, see the concluding lines of the description of the Sicilian earthquake, in the 2d book of the *Task*. Paley has noticed a similar peculiarity in St. Paul.

Of the general merits of Mr. Gifford's translation, our readers will in some measure be able to judge from the extracts which we shall subjoin. It appears to us, both in its excellencies and defects, to resemble the author's version of Juvenal. Among the latter, however, we ought in justice to observe that we do not reckon the freedom, and occasional roughness, of the versification, which we agree with the author in considering as appropriate and characteristic.

In perusing the first Satire, it was impossible not to bear in mind the piquant imitation in the Baviad; a recollection which, as may be supposed, subtracted somewhat from our pleasure. The commencement is as follows :

Alas, for man ! how vain are all his cares !
And oh ! what bubbles, his most grave affairs !
'Tush ! who will read such thread-bare— ?'

This to me ?

'Not one, by Jove.' Not one ? 'Well ! two, or three ;
Or rather—none ; a piteous case, in truth !'
Why piteous ? lest *Polydamas*, forsooth,
And *Troy's proud dames*, pronounce my merits fall
Beneath their *Labeo's* ! I can bear it all.

Nor should my friend, though still, as fashion sways,
The purblind town conspire to sink or raise,
Determine, as her wavering beam prevails,
And trust his judgment to her coarser scales.
O ! not abroad for vague opinion roam ;
The wise man's bosom is his proper home :
And Rome is—'What ?' Ah, might the truth be told !—
And, sure it may, it must.—

When I behold
What fond pursuits have form'd our prime employ,
Since first we dropt the play-things of the boy,
To gray maturity,—to this late hour,
When every brow frowns with Censorial power,
Then, then—'O yet suppress this carping mood.'
Impossible:—I could not, if I wou'd ;
For nature framed me of satiric mould,
And spleen, too petulant to be controll'd.

The allusion in the following note is sufficiently obvious ; of its justice the reader must judge for himself.

Sat. i. l. 137. *There are, who hunt out, &c.*] The literary taste of the Roman people seems not to have improved as rapidly as some of their best writers desired. Though furnished with correcter models, they continued to look back with fondness to the early specimens of art ; and the obstinacy of their attachment to the writings of *Pacuvius*, *Accius*, *Lucilius*, &c. furnished the critics of the Augustan age with perpetual subjects of complaint. The fastidiousness of *Horace* on this subject has been already noticed. His quibbling remonstrances, however, had no effect:—and, after a lapse of three-score years, the same complaint is reproduced in stronger language. But the warmth of our author is better

Notice of Gifford's

founded than that of his predecessor. It is not of their general merits that Persius speaks in this place; for of these he probably thought pretty much like his contemporaries; but of their defects, which the fashion of the day recommended to imitation. A corrupt age is always an affected one. Simplicity is lost in silliness; and vigor in gigantic tumor: the rude and obsolete terms of the old dramatists were sedulously culled to gratify a morbid taste, a sickly delicacy which had no relish of nature, and to the indulgence of which the poet justly attributes the corruption of forensic eloquence, and the debility of metrical composition.

The following passage on this subject, from one of the old grammarians, is highly curious. 'Quid' (says Diomedes, treating of his own times,) 'Quid quod nihil jam proprium placet, dum parum creditur disertum quod alius dixerit?' A corruptissimo quoque poetarum figuras seu translationes mutuamur, tum demum ingeniosi, si ad intelligendos nos, opus sit ingenio!

The Accius mentioned by Persius, (for there were several of the name,) was a tragic writer of considerable celebrity. His general style appears to have been uncouth but vigorous: dark, rugged, and sublime. All his tragedies were not like *Briseis*,¹ which was probably strongly marked by his characteristic defects, and therefore selected as a model for the rising generation! One specimen of the tortuous bombast of this poet may amuse the reader:

'Indecorabiliter alienos alunt,
Ut rorulentas terras ferro fidas proscindant glebas.'

Pacuvius, who preceded Accius many years, was yet more eminent. His tragedies were long the delight of the Roman stage. Cicero speaks with commendation of his *Orestes*, though he does not overlook its defects. Of *Antiopa*, all that remains, perhaps, is the fragment in the text—*arumnis cor luctificabile fulta*—which, to say the truth, has a suspicious appearance, and is, not improbably, somewhat unfairly quoted by our poet.

The metaphor, which is so forced and unnatural as to obscure the meaning, is thus paraphrased by Holyday:

'Whose woeful heart was nourished with grief,
The depth of sorrow yielding some relief;'

which, though it defeats the object of the satire, is, at least, intelligible, and not much unlike the language of Shakspeare's lady Constance, who, as well as *Antiopa*, renounced the consolations of hope, to gather resolution from despair.

But Persius not only laughs at the quaintness, but at the antiquated barbarisms of this unfortunate verse. *Luctificabile*, I believe, must be given up; and Quintilian (who thought on this subject very much like our author, and that the copiers of the obsolete language of Ennius did not always understand the terms which they borrowed from him) seems to justify the censure of *arumna*, which was then grown obsolete. What need is there, he says, of this word when we have *labor*? There is no disputing with Quintilian on such a subject; but *labor* must have lost, or *arumna* gained considerably since his time, if we understand the two

¹ Written, perhaps, on the same subject as the *Bacchæ* of Euripides. Persius calls the poet Brisean Accius, so that he might be familiarly mentioned by this piece, which was probably esteemed his best.

words correctly at present. Finally, though a profuse and indiscriminate introduction of obsolete terms is not to be commended, a sparing and judicious use of them has its advantages; and, at all events, a language is not much the worse for possessing two words with nearly the same meaning.

Again :

It may not be amiss to add, that a depreciation of the standard poetry is, in every country, one of the most striking signs of a decay of taste ; and that it is usually accompanied, as here, by a passion for the crude and imperfect productions of an earlier age. 'There is more in this than nature was ever conduct of, if philosophy could find it out.'

The character of Horace, in the same Satire, is thus rendered :

— arch Horace, while he strove to mend,
Probed all the foibles of his smiling friend ;
Play'd lightly round and round the peccant part,
And won, unfelt, an entrance to his heart ;
Well skill'd the follies of the crowd to trace,
And sneer, with gay good humor in his face.

On the celebrated lines in the second Satire, (73, 74) 'Compositum jus fasque animo,' &c. our translator expresses himself with unusual enthusiasm.

In what follows, Persius may be more easily admired than translated. His lines are not only the quintessence of sanctity, but of language. Closeness would cramp, paraphrase would enfeeble their sense, which, like Juvenal's abstract idea of a perfect poet, may be felt but cannot be expressed.

We give his translation of the whole passage.

O grovelling souls ! and void of things divine !
Why bring our passions to the Immortals' shrine,
And judge, from what this CARNAL SENSE delights,
Of what is pleasing in their purer sights ?—
This the Calabrian fleece with purple soils,
And taints with rich perfume, our native oils ;
Tears from the rocky conch its pearly store,
And strains the metal from the glowing ore :
THIS, THIS, indeed, is vicious ; yet it tends
To gladden life, perhaps ; and boasts its ends ;
But you, ye pontiffs, (for ye know) declare,
'What gold avails in sacrifice and prayer ?'
No more, alas ! than the poor puppets laid,
On Venus' altar, by the riper maid,
(The playthings of the child.)—O, be it mine,
To bring, whenever I tread the courts divine,
What, great Messala ! thy degenerate heir,
From his great charger, cannot offer there,
Justice to man, essentially combined
With piety to God, in the pure mind ;
The heart's devout recesses ; the clear breast,
With generous honour's glowing stamp impress'd,
And Heaven will hear the humble prayer I make,
Though all my offering be a barley cake.

The description of Natta in the third Satire (a passage which reminds us of the best manner of Dryden), and the apostrophe which succeeds, are thus rendered :

—But Natta's is not *life* : the sleep of sin
Has seiz'd his powers, and palsied all within ;
Huge cawls of fat envelope every part,
And torpor weighs on his insensate heart.—
Absolv'd from blame by ignorance so gross,
He neither sees, nor comprehends his loss ;
Content in guilt's profound abyss to drop,
Nor, struggling, send one bubble to the top.
Dread sire of Gods ! when lust's envenom'd stings
Stir the fierce natures of tyrannic kings ;
When storms of rage within their bosoms roll,
And call, in thunder, for thy just control,
O, then relax the bolt, suspend the blow ;
And thus, and thus alone, thy vengeance show,
In all her charms, set Virtue in their eye,
And let them see their loss, despair, and—die !

The conclusion of the fourth Satire (' *Respue quod non es, &c.*) is happily given :

Hence, with your spurious claims ! rejudge your cause,
And fling the rabble back their vile applause :
To your own breast, in quest of worth, repair,
And blush to find—how poor a stock is there !

The fifth Satire our veteran translator agrees with Dryden in considering as the masterpiece of Persius. As our former extracts have been for the most part short, we shall here venture on a more extended quotation, and one which, though (like the rest) a favorable specimen, will afford the reader a better idea of the translator's general manner. It is the poet's address to his preceptor, and seems to be translated more *con amore* than most of the other passages. We could not indeed help being reminded of the pleasing tributes of private attachment contained in the *Mæviad*.

PERSIUS.

Poets are wont a hundred mouths to ask,
A hundred tongues,—whate'er the purposed task—
Whether a Tragic tale of Pelops' line,
For the sad actor, with deep-mouth, to whine ;
Or Epic lay ; the Parthian wing'd with fear,
And wrenching from his groin the Roman spear.

CORNUTUS.

Heavens ! to what purpose, (sure, I heard thee wrong,)
Tend those huge gobbets of robustious song,
Which, struggling into day, distend thy lungs,
And need a hundred mouths, a hundred tongues ?
Let fustian bards to Helicon repair,
And suck the spongy fogs that hover there,

Bards, in whose fervid brains, while sense recoils,
The pot of Progne, or Thyestes boils,
Dull Glyco's feast!—But what canst thou propose?
Puff'd by thy heaving lungs, no metal glows;
Nor dost thou, mumbling o'er some close-pent strain,
Croak the grave nothings of an idle brain;
Nor swell, until thy cheeks, with thundering sound,
Displode, and spirt their airy froth around.

Confined to common life, thy numbers flow,
And neither soar too high, nor sink too low:
There strength and ease in graceful union meet,
Though polsh'd, subtle, and though poignant; sweet;
Yet powerful to abash the front of crime,
And crimson error's cheek with sportive rhyme.

O still be this thy study, this thy care;
Leave to Mycenæ's prince his horrid fare,
His head and feet; and seek, with Roman taste,
For Roman food—a plain but pure repast.

PERSIUS.

Mistake me not. Far other thoughts engage
My mind, Cornutus, than to swell my page
With air-blown trifles, impotent and vain,
And grace, with noisy pomp, an empty strain.
Oh, no: the world shut out, 'tis my design,
To open (prompted by the inspiring Nine)
The close recesses of my breast, and bare
To your keen eye, each thought, each feeling, there;—
Yes, best of friends! 'tis now my pride to own,
How much that 'breast' is fill'd with you alone!
Ring then—for, to your practised ear, the sound
Will shew the solid, and where guile is found
Beneath the varnish'd tongue. For *this*, in fine,
I dared to wish an hundred voices mine;
Proud to declare, how closely twined you dwell—
How deeply fix'd in my heart's inmost cell,
And paint, in words,—ah, could they paint the whole!
The ineffable sensations of my soul.

When first I laid the purple by—and, free,
Yet trembling at my new-felt liberty,
Approach'd the hearth, and on the Lares hung
The bulla, from my willing neck unstrung;
When gay associates, sporting at my side,
And the white boss, display'd with conscious pride,
Gave me, uncheck'd, the haunts of vice to trace,
And throw my wandering eyes on every face;
When life's perplexing maze before me lay,
And error, heedless of the better way,
To straggling paths, far from the route of truth,
Woo'd, with blind confidence, my timorous youth,
I fled to you, Cornutus, pleased to rest
My hopes and fears on your Socratic breast;
Nor did you, gentle Sage, the charge decline:
Then, dextrous to beguile, your steady line

Reclaim'd, I know not by what winning force,
 My morals, warp'd from virtue's straighter course,
 While reason press'd incumbent on my soul,
 That struggled to receive the strong control,
 And took, like wax, subdued by plastic skill,
 The form your hand imposed—and bears it still!

Can I forget, how many a summer's day,
 Spent in your converse, stole, unmark'd, away?
 Or how, while listening with increas'd delight,
 I snatch'd from feasts, the earlier hours of night?
 —One time (for to your bosom still I grew)
 One time of study, and of rest, we knew;
 One frugal board, where, every care resign'd,
 An hour of blameless mirth relax'd the mind.

And sure our lives, which thus accordant move,
 (Indulge me here, Cornutus,) clearly prove,
 That both are subject to the selfsame law,
 And from one horoscope their fortunes draw:
 And whether destiny's unerring doom,
 In equal Libra, poised our days to come;
 Or friendship's holy hour our fates combined,
 And to the Twins, a sacred charge, assign'd;
 Or Jove, benignant, broke the gloomy spell
 By angry Saturn wove;—I know not well—
 But sure some star there is, whose bland control,
 Subdues, to yours, the temper of my soul!

The Argument to the sixth Satire concludes as follows:

This Satire is not only the most agreeable and original, but the most interesting of our author's works. It was evidently written by him, while yet in the flower of youth, possessed of an independent fortune, of estimable friends, of dear connexions, and of a cultivated mind, under the consciousness of irrecoverable disease;—a situation in itself sufficiently affecting, and which is rendered still more so by the tranquil, placid, and even cheerful spirit with which every part of it is pervaded.

Our last quotation shall be from the opening of the sixth Satire.

Say, have the wintry storms, which round us beat,
 Chased thee, my Bassus, to thy Sabine seat?
 Does music there thy sacred leisure fill,
 While the strings quicken to thy manly quill?—
 O skill'd, in matchless numbers, to disclose
 How first from Night this fair creation rose;
 And kindling, as the lofty themes inspire,
 To smite, with daring hand, the Latian lyre!
 Anon, with youth and youth's delights to toy,
 And give the dancing chords to love and joy;
 Or wake, with moral touch, to accents sage,
 And hymn the heroes of a nobler age!

THE ARITHMETIC OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

No. II.—[Continued from No. XLIX. p. 32.]

HONORED by your prompt attention to my Introductory suggestions on the subject of *Biblical Arithmetic*, I proceed to submit some farther observations on this interesting topic:—relating chiefly to *Numbers*.

The Hebrews have employed their letters to express numbers; but whether this practice originated with themselves, or was derived from the Arabians or Greeks, it is difficult to decide. The learned Calmet says, (*Bib. Encyclop.—Letters*):—‘I do not believe the ancient Hebrews did so, nor that letters were numerical among them. I see no evidence of this in Scripture. The sacred authors always write the numbers entire, and without abbreviation.’

The Jews and Greeks, in numerically valuing their letters, arranged them in three divisions: the former used their five finals, and the latter invented five new characters, in addition to their alphabet.

1st. The first nine denote units; as,

א	ב	ג	ד	ה	ו	ז	ח	ט
α'	β'	γ'	δ'	ε'	ς'	ζ'	η'	θ'
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

2d. The following nine represent tens; as,

י	כ	ל	מ	נ	ס	ע	פ	צ
ι'	κ'	λ'	μ'	ν'	ξ'	ο'	π'	ς'
10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90

3d. The last nine express hundreds; as,

ק	ר	ש	ת	ך	ם	ן	ף	ץ
ρ	σ	τ	υ	φ	χ	ψ	ω	Ω
100	200	300	400	500	600	700	800	900

The Syrians have made the same use of their alphabet; and so have the Arabians and Persians, notwithstanding they have regular figures besides. The Greeks expressed numbers by their large as well as small letters; and used their alphabet in its natural order, to represent a consecutive series, or marks of division. Thus the 24 books of the Iliad and Odyssey are marked by the 24 letters, as the

stanzas of the 119th psalm are by the Hebrew letters. (Dr. Valpy's Greek Gram. p. 32. 7th ed.)

The numbers which occur in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures are chiefly the following:

אחד	εἷς	one
שני	δύο	two.

The Hebrew term literally denotes the repeated number.

שלוש	τρεῖς	three
ארבע	τεσσαρες	four,

from רבע, to agitate; 'because,' says Parkhurst, 'it was the fourth day on which the sun, moon, and stars were formed, and the natural agitation of the celestial fluid began.'

חמש	πεντε	five.
-----	-------	-------

This word is first applied to the fifth day of the creation, when the world was arrayed or set in order, for the reception of man and animals, Gen. i. 23. The Greek, according to Martinius, may be derived from *πας, παντος*, all; as this number is equal to that of all the fingers on each hand.

שש	εξ	six,
----	----	------

first used in reference to the sixth day—the day of exultation for the finishing of the creation of this system, Gen. i. 31.

שבע	επτα	seven.
-----	------	--------

Sufficiency or perfection is the import of this term: and, according to Parkhurst, both the Greek and English are derivations from the Hebrew.

שמונה	οκτω	eight.
-------	------	--------

The Hebrew denotes the superabundant number, and the Greek is said to be derived from *ωχρα δυο*, eminently two, as being the cube of that number.

תשע	εννεα	nine.
-----	-------	-------

'Is not,' asks Parkhurst, 'this a derivative from *שעה*, to turn; as denoting that number which turns from units to a higher order of numbers?'

עשר	δεκα	ten.
-----	------	------

The import of each of these terms evidently signifies, the rich number, including all units under it.

מאה	εκατον	hundred.
-----	--------	----------

An extensive number, from the Arabic *صالح* to dilate or extend.

אלף χίλις thousand.

The Greek is said to come from כלה completion, as being the cube of 10, or being formed by multiplying 10 twice into itself: as the Latin mille may be from מלא, to fill.

לגיון λεγεων legion.

The Syriac is plainly from the Greek.—Mark v. 9, 15. The Roman legion then consisted of about 4200 foot, and 300 horse.

כס; μυριοι ten thousands, or

denoting a number which is immense, innumerable, in both languages.

The terms employed by the art or science of Biblical Arithmetic, are,

ספר—to enumerate, compute, cypher. It simply denotes the act of numeration, or calculation. In general, when מספר, number, is placed *after* the substantive with which it is connected, it signifies a few, as Gen. xxxiv. 30: but when *before* it, many; as Job xxxvi. 26.

דשב—a reckoning, a finished computation, or addition. Consult Lev. xxv. 27. Eccl. vii. 27.

כס—to count, reckon together, or to make a contrasted account. Exod. xii. 4, and Num. xxxi. 28, seem to require this meaning of the term.

מנה—a distribution, or division; whether by number or order. See, for this purpose, Gen. xiii. 16, and 1 Kings xx. 25.

And if these explanations be correct, may not the above terms be considered as expressing the fundamental principles, or rules, of the arithmetic of Holy Scripture?

Αριθμος—number, is the usual Greek term employed to express this idea; for which, the Syriac has ܠܝܬܝܢ in the New Testament.

A correct understanding of Scriptural numbers can scarcely be attained, without a knowledge of the methods of numeration which are practised among the Orientals. The very acute and learned Editor of Calmet has offered some ingenious illustrations on this subject; particularly in his valuable publication entitled, 'Scripture Illustrated by means of Natural Science, &c.:' from which a few selections shall now be made. After some introductory observations on the immense enumerations, in the beginning of Numbers, he says: 'The fact is, the numbers as they stand by fair inference are impossible; but, where is the

error, and how shall we discover it? He maintains the necessity of *cutting off cyphers* as the only possible method of correcting and verifying those apparently incredible numbers. Having cited and established some apposite instances from the Asiatic Researches, Herodotus, and Diodorus Siculus, he judiciously concludes with stating: ‘ Since then we find, that the ancient Hindoo books, the ancient Chaldean books, the ancient Egyptian books, all agree in the same mode of incorrectness, and are apparently restored to correctness, by removing the cyphers, need we wonder if a similar evil has, in one or two places, attended the Hebrew copies also? But to what could this be owing? Did the original writers use cyphers? Or, did they use terms whose genuine signification was afterwards lost, or the notation of which became afterwards misunderstood? How should this happen in countries so remote from each other? There must be some common source of this error, for that it is a wilful mistake, I cannot allow.”

The Arabians have a very singular idiom in their dates, and other large numbers, placing generally the units before the tens, the tens before the hundreds, and the hundreds before the thousands; though it is not uncommon, even in the same passage, to follow both methods. (Richardson’s Arab. Gram. p. 48.) May not this satisfactorily explain the enumeration of 1 Sam. vi. 19, placing the numbers on the principle of the Arabic notation?

שבעים איש	70
חמשים	100
אלף איש	1000

total 1170 persons.

Certainly this is a much more probable number than the 5070 of our common version!

Apparent contradictions in the Sacred Writings, arising from the difference of numbers, may proceed from the Scriptures speaking in whole or round numbers—from numbers being taken exclusively or inclusively—from various readings—and from the New Testament writers sometimes quoting numbers from the Septuagint version instead of the Hebrew text.—Horne’s Intro. &c. i. p. 594-598. 2d ed.

As writing, and numeration also, has certainly undergone variations in the manner of being read; having been sometimes read from left to right, at other times from right to left, it is evident that a small degree of inattention in copying, to

adjust passages where numbers are recorded, would have the effect of producing cyphers, where they were not originally intended. The influence which this change of mode might have, may be readily perceived by inspecting the figure of an abacus,* or numeration tablet.

“We are not to blame the Sacred Books for our own non-understandings: if we cannot reckon their numbers properly, what follows? Not that they are erroneous, but that we are ignorant; and if we be ignorant, the thought should not only stimulate us into further researches, but should render us grateful to any who, by communication of their remarks, may help to lead us to more correct principles.”

“It is very true, that these numbers are not articles of faith, nor can they justly pretend to equal importance; but they are of importance. They have furnished arguments to freethinkers and infidels, of which it is desirable honestly and fairly to deprive them: they have embarrassed the humble but hearty friends to revelation; and is it not then to be wished that they were entirely corrected? not by fancying errors in the sacred books, but by superior information and knowledge, derived from those very countries where the Scriptures were originally written: especially as to this day they have retained some of those peculiarities, which we in our western situation find perplexing; and others might in time be traced and unravelled by persevering diligence.”

Oswestry, April, 1822.

J. W.

ATHENARUM PANORAMA, SEU GRÆCIÆ VETERIS ENCOMIUM.

QUUM mea respiceret primæ tentamina musæ
RICHELIUS, caroque inscriptos nomine libros

* So called from *פֶּחַל*, dust; because it was a little table strewed over with dust, on which the ancient mathematicians drew their schemes and figures. Very ancient—if later than computing by the fingers, and by lapilli or stones, (which obtained among the Egyptians,) it was prior to the use of numeral letters, or figures wrought with the pen. In use among the Chinese, Greeks, Romans, &c.—Howard’s Encyclop. p. 6.

Mitteret,¹ Ausoniæ decora immortalia linguæ,
 Classica quæ stabunt patrui monumenta laboris ;
 Tum me regifisci memorem bene gratiâ doni
 Impulit, augustas ut Mæcenatis ad ædes
 Ipse pias ferrem congesto pectore grates ;
 Felix ! præsentem iterum si cernere vultus,
 Atque oculis totam licuisset pandere mentem !

Tunc vero vigiles inter solenne ministros
 Concilium imperii LODOIX de rebus habebat.
 RICHELIVS lateri adsistens, sceptrique levando
 Par oneri, justæ libratam examine lancis
 Fortunam Europæ, et pendentia fata tenebat,
 Invigilans populis ac regibus : alter ab illo
 RICHELIO ingenti, qui turbida môbilis ævi
 Tempora sortitus, mersusque furentibus undis,
 Instantes alta vincebat fronte procellas ;
 Qui nunquam arbitrio popularis deditur auræ,
 Stabat in incœpto constans et firmus eodem ;
 Quique rebellantem populum, proceresque superbos
 Legitimo domini regis sub jure coërcens,
 Magne, tibi, LODOIX, regnum immortale paravit.

Jamque fere media repetebam luce penates,
 Qua via Borboniæ celeberrima nomine pacis²
 Desinit, et duplex ulmorum obtenditur ordo,
 Qui cinctu arboreo reginam amplectitur urbem.

Ecce viri socio properabant agnине ; doctum
 Nescio quid spirat frons non incognita ; doctos
 Alma supercilii gravitas, austeraque produnt
 Lumina ; et incessu poteras agnoscere doctos.
 Nec mora fit ; salva vix majestate ruebant,
 Egregiam donec tulit impetus ipse phalangem
 Famosi ante fores spatiosa mole theatri,
 Quod nostri a græco vertunt Panorama vocantes.
 Ingens artis opus ! quid non industria mentis
 Humanæ valuit fœcundò extundere nisu ?
 Nequicquam fluviis et dissociabilis æstu
 Oceani inter se terras Deus abscidit ; artis
 Auxilio, æternæ franguntur vincula legis ;
 Undique collectas nostra inter mœnia gentes
 Cogimus ; et totum parvus tenet angulus orbem.

¹ Le Duc de Richelieu, Président du Conseil des Ministres, a envoyé à l'Auteur un exemplaire des Classiques Latins.

² La rue de la Paix, et le boulevard des Capucins.

Isacidæ hic nuper, vaga gens Ierrasque per omnes
Exsul, Idumææ vestigia sancta Sionis,¹
Et plenos patrio quærebant numine campos :
Sed nunc adspicio, mutata sorte locorum,
Hellenistarum ferventem ad limina turbam.
Hanc ad Olympicæ credas spectacula pompæ
Currere ; et Alpei celebres invisere ripas,
Luminibusque sequi fugientes carcere currus.

Nempe Sophocleæ steterant hic lumina linguæ :
Boissonades,² custos æterni sedulus ignis,
Hellados ad nostras antistes maximus oras :
Hinc, quî, Cecropios ausus deflectere fontes,
Sicania Gallos ditavit messe, Gaïllus :³
Hinc et Burnofius,⁴ quî, Phœbo iudice, victor,
Grammatices palmam decerpuit, et arte magistra
Nuper Homerei reseravit limina templi.
Pone sequens alios, risu prodente, latebat
Emuncto Plaucus⁵ suspendens omnia naso,
Ille in Pierio bene notus vertice Plancus,
Quem calamo, et cithara pariter, lituoque canentem
Inter Sequanicos Arvernica misit olores ;
Qui modo telluris scrutatus viscera Graiæ,
Et lentum properans oleo vigilante laborem,
Post longos tandem grave *Lexicon* edidit annos :
Hunc vos, Barbicolæ, gaudetis habere magistrum ;
Hic vos, Barbicolæ, gaudet sibi jungere fratres.
Ille mihi (prospexit enim), " Carissime, dixit,
Ingredere huc mecum ; te noto tramite ducam.
Fert animus, non visa tibi miracula rerum,
Cecropiam⁶ monstrare suis cum civibus urbem.

¹ Le Panorama de Jérusalem.

² M. Boissonade, professeur de littérature grecque à la faculté des Lettres de Paris, éditeur de Philostrate, de Tiberius Rhetor, d'Herodien, de Nicetas, &c.

³ M. Gail, professeur de littérature grecque au collège de France ; auteur d'une traduction française de Théocrite, éditeur de Thucydide, etc.

⁴ M. Burnouf, professeur d'éloquence latine au collège de France, auteur de la grammaire grecque adoptée par l'Université ; éditeur de Salluste, etc.

⁵ M. Planche, ancien élève, puis maître de Sainte-Barbe, dont les poésies latines dans tous les genres sont très-connues ; auteur d'un Dictionnaire grec, adopté par l'Université, éditeur de Démosthène ; etc.

⁶ Le Panorama d'Athènes, qui vient d'ajouter un nouveau titre à la grande réputation de M. Prévost.

Hos accede locos, monumentaque temporis acti
 Conscia, sæclorum victricem consule famam,
 Et prima omnigenæ cunabula laudis adora."

Vadimus obscuri : nec luminis ulla maligni
 Incertos scintilla regit sub fornice passus ;
 Dum pes tentat iter, motu manus altera cæcos
 Explorat protensa gradus : lux pallida sensim
 Albentes abigit tenebras ; mox largior æther
 Panditur, interiorque patet prospectus : "Athenas
 Conclamant omnes, et quisque salutat Athenas.

Ut vidi, ut stupui ! sacer ut me perculit horror !
 Quum subitæ ad lucis radios cedentibus umbris,
 Grandis Athenarum se circumfudit imago.

Omnibus idem animus cognoscere fata locorum,
 Ordine quæque suo ; sed dum loca fœta triumphis,
 Et tacitas studiosa cohors interrogat umbras,
 Exsurgit medius, longo venerabilis ævo,
 Et Graiis eheu ! Coraësi¹ dudum exul ab oris.

Ille avido lustrans natales lumine campos,
 Immemor exsilii, blandaque in imagine totus,
 Pascit inexplèto corda exsultantia visu.
 Inde viam demum laxant pia gaudia voci :

" Salvete, æterni cineres, memoresque ruinæ !
 Salve, magna parens, o plena superstitute fama,
 Plena Deis ! Tu sola meo sub pectore vives,
 Perpetuo tu sola mihi celebrabere cantu,
 O patria ! et dulces moriens reminiscar Athenas.

Heu ! **qualem** adspicio ! **qualem** fecere tyranni,
 Sæclorumque vices ! quæ quondam cara Minervæ,
 Per populos regina, caput super astra ferebat,
 En jacet ; at magni semper stat nominis umbra.
 Palladii pereunt sub pulvere marmora templi :²
 Nunc ubi solemnes delubra ad maxima pompæ ?
 Nunc ubi votivis redolentes ignibus aræ ?
 Pallas ubi est ? Quid enim tanta de sorte relictum ?
 Nil nisi ruderibus superobruta rudera, molesque

¹ M. Coraï, né en Grèce, et auquel les plus savans hellénistes de Paris se plaisent à céder la palme.

² Le Parthénon, bâti sous Périclès, en l'honneur de Minerve, avait résisté aux injures des temps et des révolutions, lorsqu'en 1687, Athènes, assiégée par les Vénitiens, vit tomber sous leurs coups une partie de ce majestueux édifice. C'est dans ce temple qu'était la statue de Minerve, chef-d'œuvre de Phidias.

Alta ruinarum, tantæ quoque dſſbita morti.
Phidiacæ jam nulla manent miracula dextræ ;
Sed decus artificis, crescendo sæcula vincit :
Grata Minerva suum Plutoni invidit alumnum.

Forsan et antiquos ritus meminisse juvabit.
Cernite saltantes placati ad limina 'Thesei ;'
Ut, dum Dædaleos intexunt orbibus orbes,
Mobilibus simulant Labyrinthi devia ludis,
Atque indepreſſo miscent errore choreas.
Post superos, sit honor tibi, virtus proxima cœlo :
Scilicet hic triplici pumex latebrosus hiatu,
Carcere Areopagi,² Themidem incusavit iniquam !
Socratis hic jacuit corpus ; meus recta dolentes
Inter discipulos, ipsoque ex funere major,
Immortalem animum morienti voce docebat.
Hic mortem immeritam Phocion interritus hausit,
Sed mulier Megarea dedit requiescere manes.
Te quoque, Aristides, extorrem abscedere jussit
Invidia ; at Justum te plebs injusta vocavit."

Vix ea ; conticuit senior, paulumque moratus
Ingemuit, tanquam facta invidiosa revolvens,
Ingratas animo invitatus revocaret Athenas.
Interea hærebant animis pendentibus omnes
Intenti ; et rerum pariter dulcedine capti
Floquioque senis, fortunam audire vicesque
Hellados exposcunt, et amicis vocibus instant.

Tum senior monstrat, qua traxit parte³ ruinam
Argos, et eversi jacuere Agamemnonis arces ;
Monstrat et Hippolyti funestum sanguine litus ;
Ac bimarem, quo nunc datur omnibus ire, Corinthum ;
Indigitatque procul muris Lacedæmonia nudam,
Unde Leonidas Spartanum in Persica robur
Bella gerens, ad Thermopylas accurrit ; ibique
Barbaricam rabiem opperiens Asiamque ruentem,

¹ Le temple expiatoire, qui fut dédié à Thésée huit siècles après sa mort. A son retour de Crète, ce héros institua des danses où l'on imitait les détours du Labyrinthe ; cet usage s'est conservé jusqu'à nos jours.

² Sur la colline du Musée, trois ouvertures taillées dans le roc forment l'entrée de cette prison de l'Aréopage, où Socrate et Phocion, injustement condamnés, ont bu la ciguë.

³ Les montagnes qu'on aperçoit dans le lointain, au delà de la mer, sont celles de la Morée (Péloponnèse) ; c'est de ce côté qu'étaient Argos, Lacédémone, Corinthe, etc.

Constitit, atque una ~~tercentum~~ heroes ; et omnes
 Pro patria vitam in medio effudere triumpho.
 Fortunatam urbem ! cui contigit ista virorum
 Tam forti cum rege seges ! nea gloria surgit
 Inferior, quod Cæsareo licet addita regno,
 Et grave passa jugum, fuit ipsi intacta Neroni ;¹
 Nam qui sanguineo calcaverat omnia fastu
 Impius, austeros pedibus contingere muros,
 Et sanctum in tumulto timuit violare Lycærgum.

Mox vocem attollens : “ Et vos par laurea cinxit,
 Cecropidæ : gemino validi quoque fulminis ictu
 Stravit Achæmenios libertas vestra tyrannos.
 O quantum peperit vobis victoria nomen,
 Quum se Miltiades Persas attollere contra
 Ausus, et Eoas acies invadere parvis
 Agminibus, turbam confusa strage ruentem
 Repulit in naves, fugitivaque castra secutus,
 Æterno signavit ovans Marathona tropæo.
 Nec satis : alterius nubes immensa procellæ,
 Excidium flammæque ferens, Orientis ab oris
 Intonat horrendum ; prona formidine gentes
 Conticuere : micant prænuntia fulgura belli,
 Et freta diductos irrumpunt spumea montes.
 Quid tum Cecropidæ ? Stabant, in utrumque parati,
 Seu libertatem supremæque castra tueri,
 Seu patria moriente mori.—Qua pontus ad austrum
 Vergit, et incipiunt Ægei albescere fluctus,
 Nonne recedentes campos cœlumque videtis
 Produci spatium in longum, et nigrescere montes ?—
 Hic Salamis² fuit ; hic moles Asiatica paucis
 Succubuit ratibus, magnique superbia regis,
 Dementes secum Europæ meditata ruinas,
 Concidit ; hic pugnae spectator pallidus, iram
 Hostilem expavit, Lacedæmoniosque sequaces.

“ Proh dolor ! antiquos virtus amisit honores :
 Nulla Themistoclem prohibent dormire tropæa ;

¹ “ Un seul fait suffit à la gloire de ce peuple : quand Néron visita la Grèce, il n’osa entrer dans Lacédémone. Quel magnifique éloge de cette cité ! ” (*Chateaubriand, Itinér., tom. I.*) •

² Du haut de la citadelle, où le spectateur est placé, on aperçoit dans l’éloignement l’île de Salaminæ, que la défaite des Perses a rendue célèbre à jamais.

Ultor nullus adest qui per mare | navibus urbem
Auferat, arsurasque igni subducatur Athenas.

"Siccine præcipiti transit res bellica cursu ?
Sic igitur torrens annorum injuria, raptis
Oppida cum populis trahit, et victoribus ipsis
Involvens victos sub eodem gurgite mergit ;
Dumque suis sese desuetum classibus æquor
Obstupet, et vacui mœrent sine remige portus,
Ingenii solus vivit labor ; omnia letho.
Eripit, et docti surgunt de funere manes.
Hunc ludum tenet Isocrates ; his semper in hortis
Tendit Alexandro præceptor dignus alumno ;
Hos habitat montes Xenophon ; sequiturque juvenus
Te, divine Plato, spatiantem in littore ; nullus
Est sine laude locus, nullum sine nomine saxum.

"Cernitis extremi lapidem hunc ¹ in margine circi,
Quem ternis gradibus distinguit scansilis ordo ?
Hinc olim, Ausoniæ mox transmittenda petenti,
Jura dabat legesque Solon : hinc arte Pericles
Eloquioque potens, quocumque impellere vellet,
Plaudentem populum secum in diversa trahebat :
Hinc etiam vulgi fremitum, surdoque tumultum
Murmure vincebant Demosthenis ora tonantis,
Quum patriæ custos, et libertatis avitæ
Publicus assertor properantia fata morari
Tenderet, et solus, fulmen fatale tyrannis,
Frangere grassantem venali Marte Philippum.

"Quæritis, heu ! frustra Bacchi solemne theatrum.²
Non ipsæ potuere suum defendere templum
Aonides ; sed scripta manent semperque manebunt,
Et quos audivit resonant per sæcula cantus.
Nunc quoque, vulgatis transacti annalibus ævi,
Clio fida docet populos, et facta revolvens,
Spargit ad extremos heroum exempla nepotes.
Pindaricam meditata melos Polyhymnia plectro

¹ On sait la manière dont Thémistocle expliqua l'oracle qui conseillait aux Athéniens de se retrancher dans des murailles de bois.

² A l'extrémité du Pnyx, lieu où se tenait l'assemblée du peuple, est un socle taillé dans la pierre, et où l'on monte par trois degrés. C'est là qu'était la tribune où Solon, Périclès et Démosthène, ont prononcé leurs harangues.

³ On ne voit plus aucun vestige du théâtre de Bacchus, où Thucydide lisait son histoire de la Grèce aux peuples assemblés, où Sophocle et Euripide faisaient représenter leurs tragédies.

Victrices æternat adhuc ad Olympia palmas.
 Alta Sophocleo graditur subnixa cothurno
 Melpomene, furias incesti accendit amoris ;
 Ajacique suum defigit in ilia ferrum :
 Aut vultus mutata truces, Agamemnone natam
 Calchanti sævas mactandam adducit ad aras,
 Et fido Andromaches lacerum rigat Hectora fletu.
 Inde Thalia¹ Deos ridet, populosque, ducesque,
 Et stimulos *Vesparum* acuit, *Ranisque* quætelas
 Addit, et e *Nebulis* cogit descendere risum.

“ En longe ante alios sublimis fronte poëtas,
 Juxta Calliopen et Phœbum incedit Homerus ;
 Terrena qui sæce procul, flammantis Olympi
 Cum Jove, cum superis, meritas colit arduus arces.
 Dum miseras lustrat vultu mœrente ruinas,
 Dum legit oppressæ suspiria perditæ gentis ;
 Auditisne acri rumpentem hos pectore questus ?
 ‘ Proh ! tantis dejecta viris, oblitaque patres
 Græcia, quæ perdis steriles in fletibus annos,
 Prome mares animos, cum viribus erige mentem :
 Brachia Barbaricis surgant tibi libera vinculis ;
 I nunc, arva vocant iterum Marathonis ; et idem
 Neptunus Salamina tuam circumluit undis.
 Nil metuas, metuere ; juvat fortuna volentes. ~
 Exoriare aliquis generoso e sanguine vindex,
 Per quem prisca novis reddatur Græcia Græiis ;
 Græcia, quæ quondam duplici spectata corona,
 Ingenio vicit, gladio quem vicerat, orbem.’ ”

P. AUG. LEMAIRE.

Dec. 1821.

¹ Les comédies d'Aristophane : Plutus, les Guêpes, les Grenouilles, les Nuées, etc.

COLLATION OF THE
SEPT. C. THEBAS OF ÆSCHYLUS with a *Ms.*
in the Library at Turin, extracted from the volume
of Amadeus Peyron, mentioned in the Literary In-
telligence, No. XLIX. p. 193.

V. 81. κόνις με πείθει. *Lectio unica nec improbabilis.* 83. τε
 αὐτὶ χρεῖμπεται βοὰ ποτάται. 85. ὀρροκτύπου. 86. ἰω, ἰω, ἰω θεοὶ
 | ἰω θεαὶ τ' ὀρρόμενον. 88. εὐτρεπῆς consonat cum emendatione
 Brunckii.

105. Scholion: "Ἰτ' ἴτε πάντες. γράφεται καὶ ἴθ' ἴτε πάντες. καὶ
 οἱ μὲν τὸ ἴθι παρακελευσματικὸν φυσὶν ἐπὶ ῥήμα, ὡς εἰ ἔλεγεν ἄγε
 ἔλθετε πάντες. οἱ δὲ τὸ ἴθι προστακτικὸν ῥῆμα ἀποτεῖνον πρὸς τὸν Ἄρην,
 πρὸς ὃν ἀνωτέρω τὸν λόγον ἐποιεῖτο. 106. ἰκέσσιον. 109. δοχμο-
 λόχων, at supra vocem γρ. δοχμολόφων. 116. κιννύρονται φόβον.
 Scholion: γράφεται δὲ καὶ διὰ δὲ τοι, καὶ συντάσσεται οὕτως οἱ διὰ
 τῶν ἰππείων δὲ γενύων χαλινὸι κιννύρονται φόβον. 127. κήδευσαι.
 130. λιταῖς σε. 132. Scholion ad v. λύκειος consonat cum Scho-
 liaste Stephani; lege tamen cum nostro ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀνατιθέναι ἐκεῖσε
 τούτῳ λύκον ὡς ἱερεῖον. 133. ἀτυᾶς cum glossa τῆς βοῆς. 134. Λα-
 τογένεια. Optima. 136. ἱ ἱ ἱ ἱ quater. 140. ἱ quater uti v. 136.
 142. καὶ πόλις ἄμμιν πάσχει. 143. ποῖ τέλος. 155. μοι abest.
 161. μέλλεσθ'. 170. εὐεστῇ φίλα. 174. τάς διαδρ. 175: διερε-
 θίσαι' cum glossa ἐνεβάλλετε, tum suprascr. γρ. διεβρόθησατ'.
 180. χ' ὅτι τῶν μεταιχμίων. 198. φόβω abest.

203. θεοὺς τοὺς τῆς ἀλous. 204. λείποι. 208. δειλῶς pro eo
 quod editur κακῶς. 237. ἀνασχῆση. 246. Scholion: Λέγοις ἄν.
 ἄττικὸν προφέρειν τὰ εὐκτικά ἂντὶ προστακτικῶν, ὡς ἐνταῦθα. τὸ γὰρ
 λέγοις ἂντὶ τοῦ λέγε, καὶ Πλάτων οὕτω πολλαχοῦ. 261. θεοῖσιν
 abest. 285. ὀκρίοισσαν.

306. πόλιν τῆδ' ὄγγυ. 318. ἀρτιπρόποις cum glossa ταῖς νέαις
 παρθένοις. 324. αἱ αἱ δυστυχῇ. 331. πρὸ τί πτόλιν. 336. διαδρο-
 μῶν. 347. ῥοβίοισι. 355. φέρειν. 359. σπουδῇ τε. καὶ τοῦδ',
 cum glossa μετὰ σπουδῆς. ib. τοῦ καταρτίζει, cum glossa εὐθετεῖ. In

α

marginē γρ οὐκ ἀπαρτίζει ἥγουν ἄρτιον ποιεῖ. Prima lectio manu
 veluti ducit ad emendationem Hermannι καταργίξει. 387. ἡ
 ἄνοια. in marginē γράφεται καὶ ἄνοιάν τινη, ἥγουν κατὰ τινὰ ἄνοιαν
 καὶ μωρίαν.

402. ἀμὸν μὲν ἀντ. 403. δικαίως πρῶμ. ὄρν. πόλειώς τρέμω.
 404. αἰμηφόρους. 406. ἄλλομένων. Scholion: τρέμω δ' αἰμοφό-

ρους. τρέμω δὲ ἰδεῖν θανάτους ^{καὶ} μνηφόρους ἤγουν ἐξ αἵματος καὶ φόνου γεγεννημένους τῶν ἐμῶν φίλων ἀπολωλότων, ἢ τῶν ἐπολωλότων ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτῶν, ἤγουν ὑμῶν. • 439. πρὴν γ' ἐμόν. 457. δέ τω. Scholion: Πέμποιμ' ἄν. πέμπω ἀντιστάτην δηλαδὴ ἐκείνου τόνδε. μετὰ τινός δὲ ἀγαθῆς τύχης πέμπω αὐτόν. 480. περίδρομον κῦτος. 481. κύκλου. Scholion consentit cum Stephani editione; at noster legit ὅλη γάρ τις παρεμφαρῆς καὶ κοίλη προσυπεμφαίνεται. 484. αὐ pro εὐ. 491. χρεῖα. 492. οὐδ'. 498. φλέγον cum glossa καίον. 499. καῖπω.

502. et 503. Hi versus transpositi sunt, ut vulgo. 508. βροτοῖσί τε καί. 511. γένοιτ' ἄν. 512. βορέαις. 517. ματρὸς. 529. ἰάπτηται cum glossa πέμπωνται. 547. θελόντων ἄν ἀληθ. 551. εἴθ' οἱ θεοί. 554. ἀλκὴν δ' ἄριστον. 560. κακῶν δ' Ἄδρ. 561. σὺν αὐτῆς πρόσμορον. 562. ὄνομα pro ὄμμα. 568. δις τ' ἐν τελευτῇ τοῦνομ'. 564. τοῦπος. 569. πηγὴν . . . δίκη. 573. ἐπὶ χθονός. 578. αὐλακα. 590. ξὺν πολίταις. 597. βία φρενῶν. 598. πόλιν μολεῖν, tum suprascr. γρ. ἐλεῖν.

601. αἶθυμος . . . λήμματος. 603. ἔστι θεσφ. 615. ὁ Ζεὺς. 618. οἷας ἀρᾶται. 620. ἐπεξιακχήσας. 622. θ' ὡς ἀνδρ. 624. καὶ γενεθλίους θεούς. 628. προσμεμηχανημένον. 637. μέμνη. 653. κακουχία cum glossa φθορᾶ. 660. ἐχθρῶ ξυστήσομαι. 666. αὐτοκτόνως. 671. τί μέμνηνας . . . μή τις σε θυμοπληθὺς. 680. αἰσχερά μοι . . . τελεί. 682. λέγουσα κέρδος πρότερον ὑστέρου μέρου. 683. κεκλήση. 685. δόμον ἐριννὺς οὗτ' ἄν. 688. οὐ θαυμάζεται. 698. ἀνυσίς οὐδὲ cum glossa τελείωσις.

702. στέργειν τοῦπος. 705. ὁλοσίοικον οὐ θεοῖς ὁμοίαν θεὸν | ἃ γὰρ νύκτωρ παρεκελεύσατο καὶ γέγονε | παναληθῆ. 711. ἡτρύνει cum glossa διεγείραι. 712. κλήροις. 719. αὐτοὶ κτάνωσιν. 722. φόνιον. 723. καθαρμόν. 735. ἀβουλίας. 736. γείνατο. 744. πιτνὸν glossa πίπτον. 747. ἀλκᾶ. 753. τελούμεν' οὐ. 755. ἀλριστῶν, in marg. γρ. ἀλφοιτῶν. 759. πολύβοτός τ' αἰὼν βροτῶν, ὅσον τότε οἰδῖπουν τιόν. 764. γένετο. 769. κρείσσων τέκνων τ' ἀπ' ὀμμάτων. 770. τέκνοις τ' ἀραίαις. 771. ἐπισκότους. 773. σφε δὲ σιδαιρόνομω διαχειρία ποτὲ λαχεῖν. 779. ὀβρίμων. 782. πύλαις. 794. νῦν pro μιν. 799. δακρύσασθαι.

800. πόλις μὲν εὐ γράσσοιχα. 806. πέπτασεν. 808. οἱ Κάδμου. Deest δὴ. 811. σωτηρία. 812. κακὸν μου καρδία περιπνεῖ κρύος. 821. deest ὡς. Codex desinit in versu 826. Versus citavi ex editione Schutzzii, Halæ 1809.

OBSERVATIONS ON

Some of the Notes in the late MR. DALZEL'S Collectanea Græca Majora: By the Rev. J. SEAGER.

No. 11.—[Concluded from No. I.]

Page 142. (from Lysias in Eratosth.) εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ κακίας ἦλθεν, ὥστε ἅμα μὲν διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνους πίστιν ὑμᾶς κατεδουλώσατο, διὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοὺς φίλους ἀπάλεσεν.

“πρὸς ἐκείνους] Pisandrum et Calleschrum.” Reiske. ἐκείνους means the Four hundred, or some of them.

Page 146. (from Lysias in Eratosth.)—ὅποτε βοηθεῖν τοσοῦτοι παρασκευάζονται. καὶ μὲν δὴ πολὺ ῥᾶον ἡγοῦμαι εἶναι, ὑπὲρ ὧν ὑμεῖς ἐπάσχετε ἀντειπεῖν, ἢ περὶ ὧν οὗτοι πεποιήκασιν ἀπολογήσασθαι.

“ἀντειπεῖν] id est h. l. κατηγορεῖν.—καὶ μὲν δὴ πολὺ ῥᾶον ἡγοῦμαι—ἀπολογήσασθαι. Tametsi multo est, mea quidem sententia, facilius hos accusare de injuriis, quas vobis dederunt, quam his est crimina purgare.” Reiske.

It would not be very consistent with the acuteness of Lysias to state, as a peculiarity in this cause, what Quintilian asserts to be common to all causes,—that it is easier to accuse than to defend. The meaning, I believe, is,—And yet I think it would be much easier even to contradict all that has been said about your sufferings, undeniable as they are, than to offer any plausible apology for the actions of these men.

Page 148. (from Lysias in Eratosth.) ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσσεσθαι βούλομαι λέγειν, τὰ πραχθέντα ὑπὸ τούτων οὐ δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνὸς κατηγοροῦ, οὐδὰ δυοῖν ἔργον ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ὁμοῦς δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς προθυμίας οὐδὲν ἐλλέλειπται. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱέρων—ὑπὲρ τε τῆς πόλεως—ὑπὲρ τε τῶν νεορίων— κ. τ. λ.

“Inter προθυμίας et ἐλλέλειπται interposui οὐδέν. ego studium contentionemque meam haud passus sum desiderari.” Reiske. No Greek scholar can help seeing the necessity of Reiske’s emendation, and the truth of his interpretation. Professor Dalzel controverts both: τοῦ δὲ σοῦ ψόφου Οὐκ ἂν στραφείην, ἐς τ’ ἂν ἥς οἶός περ εἴ.

“Sed hoc, says he, est sensum oratoris in contrarium mutare: nec οὐδὲν ullo modo interponi debuit. Non enim hoc dicit Lysias, se nihil omisisse quod dictum oportuit pro templis decorum, &c. (nor does Reiske make Lysias say any such thing.) Sed animi fervorem sibi deficere ad ver-

ba facienda pro templis deorum, &c. Nam ὅμως δὲ non hic est *Tamen, Attamen, sed Atque adeo*—ἐλλέλειπται τῆς ἐμῆς προθυμίας ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν—and accordingly *by my eagerness to speak for the temples is insufficient!*—it is inadequate to the subject; which would require the joint efforts of many. Atque hanc esse primigeniam significationem particulæ ὅμως monstravit vir doctissimus Henricus Hoogeveen. Doct. Part. Gr. L. p. 817.” Dalz.

I wish Mr. Dalzel had produced any passage in which ὅμως δὲ evidently signifies *And accordingly*. I believe those words always, without exception, mean, Notwithstanding, However, Nevertheless. This is certainly their meaning here: and whatever the authority of Hoogeveen and the Professor may be, they have no right to make Lysias talk nonsense. ἐλλέλειπται τῆς ἐμῆς προθυμίας can never possibly signify *My eagerness—is insufficient!* and if it could, Lysias would not have used the expression; he would never have said that he wanted *zeal* (προθυμία) in the cause. It is not his *zeal*, but his *powers*, that he would represent as inadequate.—Although many accusers would be requisite to do justice to the cause; yet my *zeal* has not been wanting: as far as the powers of one can go, I have done my utmost.

P. 167. (from Demosth. Phil. i.) Ἄν τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ἐβελήσγητε γενέσθαι γνώμης νῦν, ἐπειδὴ περ οὐ πρότερον, καὶ ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, οὐ δεῖ καὶ δύναιτ' ἂν χρήσιμον τῇ πόλει παράσχειν αὐτὸν, πᾶσαν ἀφείψι τὴν εἰρωνεῖαν, ἔτοιμος πράττειν ὑπάρξῃ,—ὁ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχων, εἰσφέρειν, ἃ δ' ἐν ἡλικίᾳ στρατευέσθαι συνελόντι δ' ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ἦν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἐβελήσγητε γενέσθαι, καὶ παύσησθε, αὐτὸς μὲν οὐδὲν ἕκαστος ποιήσειν ἐλπίζων, τὸν δὲ πλησίον πάντ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πράξειν,—καὶ τὰ ὑμέτερά αὐτῶν κομιεῖσθε, ἂν θεὸς ἐθέλῃ, καὶ τὰ κατεββαυμημένα πάλιν ἀναλήψεσθε, καὶ κείνον τιμωρήσεσθε.

“ἦν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἐβελήσγητε γενέσθαι] Angl. If you chose to be your own masters.” Dalz.

It is, If you are willing to depend upon yourselves; to trust to yourselves, and not to others. This is plain from the words immediately following,—καὶ παύσησθε, αὐτὸς μὲν οὐδὲν ἕκαστος—κ. τ. λ.

P. 175. (from Demosth. Olynth. i.) Ἄλλ', ὦμαι, καθήμεθα οὐδὲν ποιοῦντες· οὐκ ἐνὶ δ' αὐτὸν ἀργοῦντα οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις ἐπιτάττειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τι ποιεῖν, μὴ τί γε δὴ τοῖς θεοῖς.

Mr. Dalzel's note on this passage is curious: “οὐκ ἐνὶ (ἐνέστι) δ' αὐτὸν ἀργοῦντα ἐπιτάττειν οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις ποιεῖν τι ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ (ἐνέστι) δὴ (ἐπιτάττειν) τοῖς θεοῖς γε (ποιεῖν τι ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ).” Angl. But it is not allowable for a person, while himself

remains 'inactive, to be commanding even his friends to do any thing in his behalf,—it is not surely allowable for him at least to be commanding the gods to do any thing for him."

Μῆτι γε is *Much less*. But it is not allowable for one, remaining 'inactive himself, to task even his friends to 'act for him, *much less* the gods.—So *Περὶ παραπρ.* p. 383, l. 21, ἐπειδὴ ἐπύθετο αὐτὸν παρ' ὑμῖν τεθνεῶτα, καὶ οὐδὲ τοῦ τὸ ζῆν ὄντα κύριον αὐτῶ βεβαιῶσαι, ΜΗ ΤΙ Γ', ἃ ἐκείνῳ τόθ' ὑπέσχετο πράξαι, ἔγνω τὴν τιμὴν οὐχὶ τῷ κυρίῳ τῶν πραγμάτων δαδασκᾶς.

P. 177. (from the same oration) Φημί δὴ δεῖν εἰσφέρειν χρήματα, αὐτοὺς ἐξίεναι προθύμως, μηδέν' αἰτιάσθαι, πρὶν ἂν τῶν πραγμάτων κρατήσῃτε· τήνικαῦτα δὲ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων κρίναντας, τοὺς μὲν ἀξίους ἐπαίνου τιμᾶν, τοὺς δ' ἀδικοῦντας κολάζειν, τὰς προφάσεις δ' ἀφελεῖν, καὶ τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς ἐλλείμματα.

[τὰς προφάσεις δ' ἀφελεῖν, καὶ τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς ἐλλείμματα.] *Angl.* And to remove the pretexts formerly alleged, and the former delinquencies, as much as in you lies. *Per* ἐλλείμματα quidam hic intelligunt Reliqua, h. e. quod reliquum est stipendij nondum persolutum. *Angl.* arrears; nescio qua syntaxi. Hic potius simpliciter sonare videtur, Delicta. Augerus, nuperus Gallice Demosthenis interpres, sic vertit, ôter à vos Guerriers tout pretexte, et tout sujet de plainte." Dalz.

Reiske in his Index to Demosthenes interprets ἐλλείμματα Reliqua, pars debiti æris nondum depensa. Rest, Rückstand: but with reference to the oration against Androtion, p. 606, not to the passage now under consideration. The word ἐλλείμματα is noticed, as far as I can find, neither by Wolfe, nor Taylor, nor Reiske, in their notes, nor by the scholiasts. I think it does not convey an idea of criminality so great as *Delinquency* does in English, but that, in this passage at least, it signifies *Deficiencies*, or *failures in duty*; and that, not *moral duty*, but *political*;—neglects. καθ' ὑμᾶς is *lying with you*;—on your parts;—imputable to you.

P. 179. (from Demosth. Olynth. 3.) Οὐχὶ ταυτὰ παρίσταται μοι γινώσκειν, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὅταν τε εἰς τὰ πράγματα ἀποβλέψω, καὶ ὅταν πρὸς τοὺς λόγους, οὐς ἀκούω.

"Ordo est, οὐχὶ παρίσταται μοι γινώσκειν ταυτά. *Angl.* It is not in my power to form the same judgment." Dalz.

Rather, Very different thoughts arise in my mind, when, on the one hand, I consider the real state of affairs, and on the other, &c. &c.

Wolfe observes that Sallust has almost literally translated these words of Demosthenes, when he makes M. Cato say, *Longe mihi alia mens est, P. C. quum res atque pericula nostra considero, et quum sententias nonnullorum ipse mecum reputo.* — *παρίστασθαι* est etiam *Animo obversari*, *In mentem venire*, *Subire*. H. Steph. Thes. i. col. 1779. n. *παρίστασθαι*, *In mentem venire*. οὐχὶ ταῦτα, &c. Reiske, Ind. to Demosth.

P. 181. (from the same oration) — οὐδὲ τὸν φόβον, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μικρὸν ὄρω, τὸν (τῶν) μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐχόντων μὲν, ὥς ἔχουσι, θηβασὼν ἡμῖν, ἀπειρηκότων δὲ χρήμασι Φωκείων· μηδενὸς δ' ἐμποδῶν ὄντος Φιλίππου τὰ παρόντα καταστρεφάμενω, πρὸς ταῦτα ἐπικλίνει τὰ πράγματα. Ἀλλὰ μὴν, εἴ τις ὑμῶν εἰς τοῦτο ἀναβάλλεται ποιήσῃν τὰ δεόντα, ἰδεῖν ἐγγύθεν βούλεται τὰ δεινὰ, ἐξὸν ἀκούειν ἄλλοθι γινόμενα, καὶ βοηθοὺς ἑαυτῷ ζητεῖν, ἐξὸν νῦν ἑτέροις αὐτὸν βοηθεῖν.

“εἰς τοῦτο ἀναβάλλεται ποιήσῃν τὰ δεόντα—] *To such a degree procrastinates the discharge of his duty.*” Dalz.

εἰς τοῦτο is, Until this takes place; i. e., what Demosthenes had just before augured; until, all obstacles being removed, nothing should remain to divert Philip from attacking the Athenians.

P. 184. (from the same oration) Ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡδέα ταῦτα; οὐκ ἐστὶ τοῦθ' ὁ λέγων ἀδικεῖ· πλὴν εἰ, δεόν εὖξασθαι, παραλείπει.

“πλὴν εἰ, δεόν εὖξασθαι, παραλείπει.] τὸ εὖξασθαι, scilicet.—Angl. Unless, when he ought to pray for your prosperity, he neglect that duty.” Dalz.

Mr. Dalzel takes this too seriously.—Are these things disagreeable to you? for that the speaker is not to blame: unless it be for not giving you his prayers forsooth, instead of his advice.

Page 214. (from Xenoph. Memor. b. ii.) τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν τεθραμμένην μὲν εἰς πολυσαρκίαν τε καὶ ἀπαλότητα· κεκαλλωπισμένην δὲ τὸ, μὲν χρῶμα ὥστε λευκοτέραν τε καὶ ἐρυθροτέραν τοῦ ὄντος δοκεῖν φαίνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα, ὥστε δοκεῖν ὀρθοτέραν τῆς φύσεως εἶναι.

“τεθραμμένην εἰς πολυσαρκίαν τε καὶ ἀπαλότητα.] Angl. Pampered into a plump and enervated habit of body.” Dalz. ἀπαλότητα is softness, tenderness. κεκαλλωπισμένην—τὸ χρῶμα, ὥστε] Angl. Having her complexion so improved, as plainly to appear possessed of a greater share of red and white, than it really had.” Dalz. Having her complexion so decked, as to heighten its natural red and white.

“τὸ δὲ σχῆμα.] i. e. δὲ κεκαλλωπισμένην κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα. Angl. And having her figure set off in such a manner, that she seemed taller than she naturally was.” Dalz. ὀρθοτέραν,

straighter; or more upright. εὐμήκης ἐστὶ καὶ ὀρθή, καὶ μειδιᾷ πάνυ ἐπαγωγόν. Lucian. Dialog. Meretr. i. Here ὀρθή is plainly not *tall*; that quality being expressed by εὐμήκης.

P. 215. (from the same book) εἰν δὲ ποτε γένηται τις ὑποψία σπάνεις ἀφ' ἧν ἴσται ταῦτα, οὐ φόβος, μή σε ἀγάγω ἐπὶ τὸ πονοῦντα καὶ ταλαιπωροῦντα τῷ σώματι καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ ταῦτα πορίζεσθαι.

“οὐ φόβος (ἐστὶ,) μὴ ἀγάγω—*nihil est quod metuas ne eo te deducam ubi laborando, et ærumnis tum animi tum corporis tolerandis hæc tibi compares.*” Dalz. The word *ubi* shows that Mr. Dalzel mistook the import of the original:—οὐ φόβος, &c. is, You need not fear that I shall oblige you to procure these enjoyments by labors and sufferings of body and mind. μὴ ἀγάγω σε ἐπὶ τὸ πορίζεσθαι ταῦτα, lest I lead you into the necessity of getting these things, &c.

P. 216. (from the same book) οὐκ ἐξαπατήσω δέ σε προσιμί-οις ἡδονῆς· ἀλλ' ἢ περ οἱ θεοὶ διέθεσαν, τὰ ὄντα διηγέσσομαι μετ' ἀληθείας. τῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόνου καὶ ἐπιμελείας θεοὶ δίδασιν ἀνθρώποις.

“οἱ θεοὶ διέθεσαν, τὰ ὄντα διηγέσσομαι μετ' ἀληθείας] Ita omnes quas vidi editiones. Mihi distinguendum videbatur sic: ἢ περ οἱ θεοὶ διέθεσαν τὰ ὄντα, διηγέσσομαι μετ' ἀληθείας. Hindenburg. Angl. I will give a true account in what way the gods ordain the things that are!” Dalz.

Really, according to the punctuation of Hindenb., and the translation of Mr. Dalzel, the lady has enough upon her hands—enough to tire even Hercules: a true account of the manner in which the gods have ordained all the things that are, all things in the universe without exception. τὰ ὄντα, is nothing more than, the real state of the case;—ἢ περ οἱ θεοὶ διέθεσαν, τὰ ὄντα διηγέσσομαι μετ' ἀληθείας, means, I will tell you truly, how the matter stands by the appointment and decree of the gods.

P. 216. ἀλλ' εἴτε τοὺς θεοὺς ἴλεως εἶναι σοὶ βούλει, θεραπυστικόν τοὺς θεοὺς.—

“—Ceterum locus hicce pulcherrimus lectorum etiam hebetissimis nequit quin se commendet.” Dalz.—We may certainly conclude that it has pleased the Professor.

P. 345. (from Ælian) πλὴν οὐκ ἀπήντησε ταῦτα ταύτῃ ποθέν.

I will here transcribe what I have already offered on this passage in a small volume of Emendations on Greek Authors, published in 1808 by Mr. Parker of Oxford.

In Æliani historia de scelerato illo Macareo Mitylenensi sic legitur, Χρόνῳ δὲ ἀφικόμενος ὁ ξένος τὸ χρυσίον ἀπῆρει· ὁ δὲ εἰσα-

γαγὼν ἔνδον, ὡς ἀποδώσαν, κατέσφαξε, καὶ τὸ χρυσίον ἀνώρυξεν, ἀντ' αὐτοῦ δὲ τὸν ξένον κατέθηκε· καὶ ὤσπερ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, λανθάνειν οὕτω καὶ τὸν θεόν· πλὴν οὐκ ἀπήντησε ταῦτα ταύτῃ ποθέν. “*Hæc particula ποθέν hoc loco fere expletiva est, ut ἄλλοθεν ποθέν, elegantia potius quam necessitatis gratia.*” Upton. Particula ποθέν jungitur illa quidem vocibus quibusdam motum a loco significantibus, ut ἄλλοθεν passim; ut ἐνθένδε, Plato, Phædr. Εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐκ ΕΝΘΕΝΔΕ μέντοι ΠΟΘΕΝ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰλισσοῦ λέγεται ὁ Βορέας τὴν Ὠρείθυιαν ἀρπάσαι; ut πόρρωθεν, Lucianus in Jove Tragedo, Ἐν ἀκροβολισμοῖς ἔτι ἦσαν, ἀποσφενδονῶντες ἑλλήλοις, ΠΟΡΡΩΘΕΝ ΠΟΘΕΝ λοιδορούμενοι, ut ἐκεῖθεν, Idem in eodem, Εἰ δὲ Ζεὺς ὁ βροντῶν ἔστι, σὺ ἂν ἄμεινον εἰδείης, ΕΚΕΙΘΕΝ ΠΟΘΕΝ ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀρβύλλοις, —sed nunquam fore ut ταύτῃ ποθέν sic conjuncta reperiantur, mihi sat acceptum est. Legendum proculdubio, πλὴν ὡς ἀπήντησε ταῦτα ταύτῃ. Πόθεν; Πόθεν hic significat, (per interrogationem,) οὐδαμῶς.

Demosthenes in Timocratem, οἱ τούτῳ, παριόντες, αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα συναπολογήσονται. οὐ μὰ Δι' οὐ Τιμοκράτει χαρίσασθαι βουλόμενοι· ΠΟΘΕΝ; ἀλλ' αὐτῷ συμφόρειν ἕκαστος ἡγούμενος τὸν νόμον. Demosthen. de Coronâ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα· ΠΟΘΕΝ; πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ. Lucian. Pseudologista, Ταῦτά σοι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπειλῶ, οὐ μὰ τὸν Δία τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ εἰκάζων ἑμαυτόν· ΠΟΘΕΝ; πολλοῦ γε καὶ δέω σοὶ δὲ μυρία (ἴσως μυρίων) συνειδὼς ἱάμβων ἄξια βεβιωμένα. Demosth. De male obita legatione, Οὐχ ὡς ὅδε Φωκέας ἀπώλεσεν ἂν καθ' ἑαυτόν· ΠΟΘΕΝ; Idem in Timocratem. Οὐ προῖκα, ὦ Τιμοκράτες, (ΠΟΘΕΝ;) οὐδ' ὀλίγου δὴ τοῦτον ἔθλας τὸν νόμον. Plutarchus in vita Catonis Utic. Ἐξέπεμψας, εἶπεν, ὦ Ἀπολλωνίδη, τὸν Στατύλλιον, ἀπὸ τοῦ φρονήματος ἐκείνου καθελὼν; καὶ πέπλευκεν ὁ ἀνὴρ μὴδὲ ἀσπασάμενος ἡμᾶς; ΠΟΘΕΝ; (εἶπεν ὁ Ἀπολλωνίδης.) καίτοι πολλὰ διελέχθημεν· ἀλλὰ ὑψηλὸς ἔστι καὶ ἄτρεπτος, καὶ μένειν φησὶ, καὶ πράττειν ὃ, τι ἂν σὺ πρᾶττης. Diogenes Laertius. pag. 547. sect. 91.

Κ' οὐδὲν ἔλεξε· (ΠΟΘΕΝ;) βοῖ γὰρ λόγον οὐ πόρε φύτλη, Οὐδὲ λάλον μόσχῳ Ἀπίδα στόμα·) ἀλλὰ, &c.

Nam ita legit Henricus Stephanus.

AN INQUIRY

into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology.

By R. P. KNIGHT.

PART VII.—[Continued from No. L. p. 259.]

161. THE dog represented Mercury as the keeper of the boundary between life and death, or the guardian of the passage from the upper to the lower hemisphere; to signify the former of which, the face of Anubis was gilded, and to signify the latter, black.¹ In the Greek and Roman statues of him, the wings and petasus, or cap, which he occasionally wears upon his head, seem to indicate the same difference of character;² similar caps being frequently upon the heads of figures of Vulcan, who was the personification of terrestrial fire:³ whence he was fabled to have been thrown from heaven into the volcanic island of Lemnos, and to have been saved by the sea;⁴ volcanos being supported by water. These caps, the form of which is derived from the egg,⁵ and which are worn by the Dioscuri, as before observed, surmounted with asterisks, signify the hemispheres of the earth;⁶ and it is possible that the asterisks may, in this case, mean the morning and evening stars; but whence the cap became a distinction of rank, as it was among the Scythians,⁷ or a symbol of freedom and emancipation, as it was among the Greeks and Romans, is not easily ascertained.⁸

¹ Hic horrendum attoliens canis cervices arduas, ille superum commeator et inferum nunc atra nunc aurea facie sublimis. Apul. Metam. lib. xi.

² See small brass coins of Metapontum, silver tetradrachms of Ænos, &c.

³ See coins of Lipari, Æsernia, &c.: also plate xlvii. of Vol. 1.

⁴ Iliad A. 593. and Σ. 395.

⁵ Του ωου το ήμισιον και αστην ύπεραν. Lucian. Dial. Deor. xxvi.

⁶ Ηίλους π' επιτίθασιν αυτοις, και επι τουταις αστρικαις, ανισσομενοι την ήμισφαιρων κατασκευην. Sext. Empiric. xi. 37.; see also Achill. Tat. Isagog. p. 127 b. and 130 c.

This cap was first given to Ulysses by Nicomachus, a painter of the age of Alexander the Great. Plin. xxxv. c. x.

⁷ Πιλοφορικοι. Scythians of rank. Lucian. Scyth.

⁸ See Tib. Hemsterhuis. Not. in Lucian. Dialog. Deor. xxvi.

34 ¹ *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

162. The dog was the emblem of destruction as well as vigilance, and sacred to Mars as well as Mercury: ¹ whence the ancient northern deity, Gamr, the devourer or engulphur, was represented under the form of this animal; which sometimes appears in the same character on monuments of Grecian art.² Both destruction and creation were, according to the religious philosophy of the ancients, merely dissolution and renovation; to which all sublunary bodies, even that of the Earth itself, were supposed to be periodically liable.³ Fire and water were held to be the great efficient principles of both; and as the spirit or vital principle of thought and mental perception was alone supposed to be immortal and unchanged, the complete dissolution of the body, which it animated, was conceived to be the only means of its complete emancipation. Hence the Greeks, and all the Scythic and Celtic nations, burned the bodies of their dead, as the Hindoos do at this day; whilst the Ægyptians, among whom fuel was extremely scarce, embalmed them, in order that they might be preserved entire to the universal conflagration; till when the soul was supposed to migrate from one body to another.⁴ In this state those of the vulgar were deposited in subterraneous caverns, excavated with vast labor for the

¹ Phurnut. de Nat. Deor. c. xxi.

² See coins of Phocæa, &c.

³ Αφάρτους δε λειγουσι οὔτοι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι (κίλται) τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἐπικρατήσιν δε ποτε καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ. Strabo lib. iv. p. 197. See also Justin lib. ii. and Edda Myth. iv. and xlviii. Voluspa stroph. xlix. Vafthrud. xlvii. et seqq. The same opinion prevailed almost universally; see Plutarch. de Placit. Philos. lib. ii. c. xviii. Lucret. lib. v. ver. 92. Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. ii. Bagvat Geeta Lect. ix. And Brucker Hist. Crit. Philos. vol. i. p. 11. lib. i. Some indeed supposed the world to be eternal in its present state. Diodor. Sic. lib. i. p. 10.

Θιοτομπος δε φησι κατὰ τοὺς μαγούς, ἀπὸ μίρος τρισχίλια ἐστὶ τὸν μὲν κρατύν, τὸν δε κρατῆσθαι τῶν θίων, ἀλλὰ δε τρισχίλια μαχίσθαι καὶ πολίμειν καὶ ἀναλύνειν τὴν τοῦ ἱερίου τὸν ἱερόν· τέλος δ' ἀπολειπῆσθαι (lege ἀπολίσθαι) τὸν ἄδην, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους ἐνδαιμόνας εἶσθαι, μὴτε τροφῆς διομένους, μὴτε σκίαν ποιοῦντας. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 370. Hence the period of 6,000 years so important in ecclesiastical history.

Ἰάσσι δε καὶ Ἑλλήνης κατὰ κλυσμὴν ἡ πῦρ τὴν γῆν κατὰ περιόδους καθαιρομένην. Origen. contra Cels. lib. iv. s. 20.

Ἐστὰι γὰρ εἶσθαι κίνος αἰῶνων χρόνος
ὅταν πῦρος γιμνόντα θῆσαντες σχάσῃ
χρυσῶπος αἰθήρ· ἡ δε βοσκηθεῖσα φλοξ
ἅπαντα τ' ἀκίγεια καὶ μιταρῶμε
φλιξίει μανίεισ'· ἐπὶ δ' ἀρ' ἑλλίπῃ το πᾶν,
φρονδὸς μὲν εἶσθαι κυματῶν ἅπας βυθός,
γῆ δινδρείων ἱρμός· οὐδ' ἀνρ' εἰσι
πτιγῶτα φυλά βλαστάνει πυρουμένος·
καπιετα σωσι παῖθ' ἃ πρὸς θ' ἀπώλισι.

⁴ Herodot. lib. ii. 123.

⁵ Sophocl. in Grotii excerpt. p. 115.

purpose; while their kings erected, for their own bodies, those vast pyramidal monuments, (the symbols of that fire to which they were consigned) whose excessive strength and solidity were well calculated to secure them as long as the earth, upon which they stood, should be able to support them. The great pyramid, the only one that has been opened, was closed up with such extreme care and ingenuity, that it required years of labor and enormous expense to gratify the curiosity or disappoint the avarice of the Mohammedan prince who first laid open the central chamber where the body lay.¹ The rest are still impenetrable, and will probably remain so, according to the intention of the builders, to the last syllable of recorded time.

163. The soul, that was to be finally emancipated by fire, was the divine emanation, the vital spark of heavenly flame, the principle of reason and perception, which was personified into the familiar dæmon or genius, supposed to have the direction of each individual, and to dispose him to good or evil, wisdom or folly, with all their respective consequences of prosperity or adversity.² Hence proceeded the notion, that all human actions depended immediately upon the gods; which forms the fundamental principle of morality both in the elegant and finished compositions of the most ancient Greek poets,³ and in the rude

¹ Savary sur l'Egypte.

² 'Ο γους γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. Menand. apud Plutarch. Qu. Platon.

Ἀπαντι δαιμον ἀνδρὶ συμπαιστανται,
 νυθ; γεννημενῷ μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου·
 ἀγαθὸς· κακὸν γὰρ δαίμων· οὐ γαρυστιον
 εἶναι, τὸν βίον βλαπτοντα χρηστον· πάντα γὰρ
 δεῖ ἀγαθοὶ εἶναι τοὶ θεοί. Menandr. Fragm. incerta. No. 205.

Plutarch, according to his own system, gives two genii to each individual, and quotes the authority of Empedocles against this passage of Menander; which seems, however, to contain the most ancient and orthodox opinion.

Αὐτὴ τοῖς αὐτοῖς δαίμον' ἀνακαλουμένη. Sophocl. Trachin. 910.

Est deus in nobis; agitante calescimus illo:

Impetus hic sacræ semina mentis habet.

Ovid. Fast. lib. vi. 5.

Scit genius, natale comes qui temperat astrum,

Naturæ deus humanæ, mortalis in unum-

Quodque caput; vultu mutabilis, albûs et ater.

Horat. lib. ii. ep. ii. 187.

³ Οὗτοι μοι αἰτιῇ ἴσσι, θεοὶ νῦ μοι αἰτίοι εἰσιν

Οἱ μοι ἰφωρηγῆσαι πολλῶν πολυδάκρυον Ἀχαιῶν—

says the polite old Priam to the blushing and beautiful Helen. Agamemnon excuses himself for having injured and insulted Achilles, by saying,

—Εγὼ δ' οὐκ αἰτίος εἰμι,

ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ Μοῖρα, καὶ ἠεροφοῖτις Ἐρινυς.

Pindar continually inculcates this doctrine.

Διὸς τοι νοὸς μέγας ἥδ' ἑβριγῆς

Δαίμων' ἀνδρῶν φίλων. Pyth. i. v. 164.

Ἐπαυγνὸς; τυθὶν Δαίμονας οὐρον. Olymp. iv. v. 38.

36 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

strains of the northern Scalds:¹ for as the soul was supposed to be a part of the ætherial substance of the Deity detached from the rest; and doomed, for some unknown causes, to remain during certain periods imprisoned in matter; all its impulses, not immediately derived from the material organs, were of course impulses of the Deity.² As the principles of this system were explained in the mysteries, persons initiated were said to pass the rest of their time with the gods;³ as it was by initiation that they acquired a knowledge of their affinity, with the Deity; and learned to class themselves with the more exalted emanations, that flowed from the same source.

164. The corporeal residence of this divine particle or emanation, as well as of the grosser principle of vital heat and animal motion, was supposed to be the blood:⁴ whence, in Ulysses's

Εκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ σοφαῖς ἀνδρείας εἶσαι πρᾶπιδισσι. Olymp. ια. v. 10.

— Λαθαῖοι δὲ
καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ Δαίμον' ἀνδρείας
ἐγείντο. Olymp. θ. v. 41.
Εκ θιῶν γὰρ μάχαναι πα-
σαι βροταῖας ἀρεταῖς·
καὶ σοφοὶ, καὶ χερσὶ βίαι-
ται, περιγλωσσὶ τ' ἐφ' ὅν. Pyth. α. v. 79.

¹ See Eddas, and Bartholinus.

² Μαρτυρεῖται δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ θεολογοὶ τε καὶ μαντιεῖς, ὡς εἰς τινὰς τιμωρίας ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σωματι συνεξενταί, καὶ καθάπир ἐν σωματι τούτῳ τιθᾶται. Philolaus Pythagoric. apud Clem. Alex. Strom. iii.

Αἱ δ' ἀπὸ πλάσσεως γένεσιν ψυχῆς, καὶ σχολάζουσιν τοιοῦτον ἢ πο σωματός, εἰς ἐλευθερίαν παμπαν ἀφίεμιναι, δαίμονες εἰσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιμελείς, καθ' Ἡσίοδον. ὡς γὰρ ἀθλητὰς καταλυσάντας ἀσκήσιν ὑπο γῆρας, οὐ τέλειος ἀπολιπείν το φιλοτιμὸν καὶ φιλοσωματόν, ἀλλ' ἑτέρους ἀσκούντας ὄρωντες ἡδονταί, καὶ παρακλοῦσι καὶ συμπαραθεοῦσι· οὕτως οἱ πεπαυμένοι τῶν περὶ τὸν βίον ἀγωνῶν, δι' ἀρετὴν ψυχῆς γινομένοι δαίμονες, οὐ παντέλειος ἀτιμαζοῦσι τὰ ἐνταῦθα, καὶ λόγους καὶ σπουδὰς, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐπὶ ταῦτο γυμναζομένοις τέλειος εὐμενείας ὄντες, καὶ συμφιλοτιμουμένοι πρὸς τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐγκλινοῦνται καὶ συνεξορμωσιν, ὅταν ἐγγὺς ᾖ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀμιλλωμένους καὶ ψαύοντας ὁρῶσιν. Interloc. Pythagoric. in Plutarch. Dialog. de Socrat. Dæmon.

Καὶ μὴν ἡ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀκούεις, λέγοντες ὡς οὐδὲν οὐδαμῇ τῷ διαλυθέντι κακὸν οὐδὲ λυπηρὸν ἐστίν, οἶδα ὅτι κωλύει σε πιστεύειν δὲ πατριὸς λόγος, καὶ τὰ μαθητικά συμβόλα τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ὀργισμῶν, ἃ συνίσμεν ἀλλήλοις οἱ κοινωνοῦντες. Plutarch. ad Uxor. consol.

³ Ὡς περ δὲ λήγεται κατὰ τῶν ἐπιμνημῶν, ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον μετὰ θιῶν διαγούσα (ἡ ψυχὴ). Platon. Phæd. p. 61.

⁴ Το αἷμα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ πλείστον συμβαλλεται μέρος συνίσιοις· ἐνίοι δὲ λεγούσι, τὸ παν. Hippocrat. de Morbis, lib. i. s. xxviii.

Γνωμὴ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πεφυκέν ἐν τῇ ἁλῇ κοιλίᾳ (τῆς καρδίας), καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς ἀλλῆς ψυχῆς. τρέφεται δὲ οὐτε σιτισίῳ, οὐτε ποτίσῳ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆδος, ἀλλὰ καθάρῃ καὶ φωτεινῇ περιούσιᾳ, γεγεννητὴ ἐκ τῆς διακρίσεως τοῦ αἵματος. Hippocrat. de Corde, s. viii.

Τὸ μετ' αἷμα κυριωτάτην τῶν ἐν ὕμιν ἔχον δυνάμειν, ἔμα καὶ θερμὸν ἐστὶ καὶ ὕγρον. Plutarch. Sympos. lib. viii. c. 10.

Nullius carnis sanguinem comedetis, quia anima omnis carnis est sanguis ejus. Levit. c. xvii. v. 14. ed. Cleric.

evocation of the Dead, the shades are spoken of as void of all perception of corporeal objects until they had tasted the blood of the victims¹ which he had offered; by means of which their faculties were replenished by a re-union with that principle of vitality from which they had been separated: for, according to this ancient system, there were two souls, the one the principle of thought and perception, called *NOOΣ*, and *ΦΡΗΝ*; and the other the mere power of animal motion and sensation, called *ΨΥΧΗ*;² both of which were allowed to remain entire, in the shades, in the person of Tiresias only.³ The prophetess of Argos, in like manner, became possessed of the knowledge of futurity by tasting the blood of a lamb offered in sacrifice;⁴ and it seems probable that the sanctity anciently attributed to red or purple color, arose from its similitude to that of blood; as it had been customary, in early times, not only to paint the faces of the statues of the deities with vermilion, but also the bodies of the Roman Consuls and Dictators,⁵ during the sacred ceremony of the triumph; from which ancient custom the imperial purple of later ages is derived.

165. It was, perhaps, in allusion to the emancipation and purification of the soul, that Bacchus is called *ΛΙΚΝΙΘΗΣ*,⁶ a metaphorical title taken from the winnow, which purified the corn from the dust and chaff, as fire was supposed to purify the ætherial soul from all gross and terrestrial matter. Hence this instrument is called by Virgil the mystic winnow of Bac-

¹ Od. Δ. 152 et seq.

² Νουν μιν εν ψυχῇ, ψυχῇ δ' εν σωματι αργῶ,
'Ημᾶς εγκατεθηκε πατρὸς ἀνδρῶν τι θιῶν τι.

Orphic. Αποσπ. No. xxiv. ed. Gesner.

Secundum hanc philosophiam, ψυχῇ anima est, qua vivunt, spirant, aluntur τὰ ἐμψυχία. νους mens est, divinius quiddam, quibusdam animabus superadditum, sive inditum, a Deo. Gesner. Not. in eund.

³ ———— Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο

Μαντιὸς ἀλαου, του τι φρονεῖς ἐμπεδοὶ εἰσι·

Ἄτρω καὶ τεθνηῶτι νοεῖ πορὶ Τειρεσφονία,

Οἱ ψικπιτυσθεῖ. Odys. K. v. 492.

⁴ Pausan. lib. ii. c. iii. and iv.

⁵ Ταχὺ γὰρ ἐξάνθει το μιλθιον, ὡ τα παλαια των ἀγαλαματων ἐχρῖζον. Plutarch. εν Ρωμαικ. See also Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. xxiii. c. vii.; and Winkelman. Hist. des Arts, liv. i. c. ii.

Enumerat auctores Verrius, quibus credere sit necesse, Jovis ipsius simulachri faciem diebus festis minio illini solitam, triumphantumque corpora: sic Canillum triumphasse. Plin. ibid.

⁶ Orph. Hymn. xiv. The λικνός, however, was the mystic sieve in which Bacchus was cradled; from which the title *μύς* have been derived, though the form of it implies an active rather than a passive sense. See Hesych. in voc.

38 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

chus;¹ and hence we find the symbols both of the destroying and generative attributes upon tombs, signifying the separation and regeneration of the soul performed by the same power. Those of the latter are, in many instances, represented by very obscene and licentious actions, even upon sepulchral monuments; as appears from many now extant, particularly one lately in the Farnese palace at Rome. The Canobus of the Ægyptians appears to have been a personification of the same attribute as the Bacchus *AIKNITHZ* of the Greeks: for he was represented by the filtering-vase, which is still employed to purify and render potable the waters of the Nile; and these waters, as before observed, were called the defluxion of Osiris, of whom the soul was supposed to be an emanation.² The means, therefore, by which they were purified from all grosser matter, might properly be employed as the symbol of that power, which separated the ætherial from the terrestrial soul, and purified it from all the pollutions and incumbrances of corporeal substance. The absurd tale of Canobus being the deified Pilate of Menelaus is an invention of the later Greeks, unworthy of any serious notice.

166. The rite of Ablution in fire and water, so generally practised among almost all nations of antiquity, seems to have been a mystic representation of this purification and regeneration of the soul after death. It was performed by jumping three times through the flame of a sacred fire, and being sprinkled with water from a branch of laurel;³ or else by being bedewed with the vapor from a sacred brand, taken flaming from the altar and dipped in water.⁴ The exile at his return, and the bride at her marriage, went through ceremonies of this kind to signify their purification and regeneration for a new life;⁴ and they appear

¹ *Mystica vannus Iacchi*. Georg. i. 166. Osiris has the winnow in one hand, and the hook of attraction in the other; which are more distinctly expressed in the large bronze figure of him engraved in pl. ii. of vol i. of the Select Specimens, than in any other that we know. Even in the common small figures it is strange that it should ever have been taken for a whip; though it might reasonably have been taken for a flail, had the ancients used such an instrument in thrashing corn.

² *Certe ego transilui positas ter in ordine flammæ, Virgaque roratas laurea misit aquas.*⁵ Ovid. Fast. lib. iv. ver. 727.

³ Ἐστὶ δὲ χειρὶ ὕδωρ εἰς ὃ ἀπιβαπτον δαλον ἐκ τοῦ βωμοῦ λαμβανόντες, αὐτὸν τὴν θυσίαν ἐπιτελοῦν καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἐπεραινόντες τοὺς περὶ τὰς ἡγνίζον. Athen. lib. ix. p. 409.

⁴ Ovid. *ibid.* v. 792. et Cnippin. Not. in eund. Τοῦτο καθαιρεῖ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἀγνίζῃ, διὸ καὶ καθαραὶ καὶ ὡγνὶ διαμνηνὶ τῇ γαμήθειαν. Plutarch. *Quæst. Rom.* i. Βουλόμεναι δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀθανάτων ποιῆσαι, τὰς νύκτας εἰς πῦρ κατετιθεῖ το βέλους, καὶ περιεὶ τὰς θνητὰς σαρκας αὐτῶν. Apollodor. *Biblioth.* lib. i. c. v. s. 2.

to have been commonly practised as modes of expiation or extenuation for private or secret offences.¹ A solemn ablution, too, always preceded initiation into the Egyptian and Eleusinian mysteries;² and when a Jewish proselyte was admitted, he was immersed in the presence of three witnesses, after being circumcised, but before he was allowed to make the oblation by which he professed himself a subject of the true God. As this ceremony was supposed to wash off all stains of idolatry, the person immersed was said to be regenerated, and animated with a new soul; to preserve which in purity, he abandoned every former connexion of country, relation, or friend.³

167. Purification by fire is still in use among the Hindoos, as it was among the earliest Romans;⁴ and also among the native Irish; men, women, and children, and even cattle, in Ireland, leaping over, or passing through the sacred bonfires annually kindled in honor of Baal;⁵ an ancient title of the Sun, which seems to have prevailed in the Northern as well as Eastern dialects: whence arose the compound titles of the Scandinavian deities, Baldur, Habaldur, &c. expressing different personified attributes.⁶ This rite was probably the abomination, so severely reprobated by the sacred historians of the Jews, of parents making their sons and daughters pass through the fire: for, in India, it is still performed by mothers passing through the flames with their children in their arms;⁷ and though commentators have construed the expression in the Bible to mean the burning them alive, as offerings to Baal Moloch, it is more consonant to reason, as well as to history, to suppose that it alluded to this more innocent mode of purification and consecration to the Deity, which continued in use among the ancient inhabitants of Italy to the later periods of Heathenism; when it was performed exactly as it is now in Ireland, and held to be a holy and mystic means of communion with the great active principle of the universe.⁸

¹ Ovid. *ib. lib. v.* 679.

² Apuleii *Metamorph. lib. ix.* Diodor. *Sic. lib. i.*

³ Marsham *Canon Chronic. s. ix. p. 192.*

⁴ Πυρκαϊας προ των σκηπων γενεσθαι κελευσας (ὁ Ρωμυλος), εξαγει τον λεων τας φλογας περιβρωσκοντι της δσιωσικως των σωματων ηνικα. *Dionys. Hal. A. R. l. lxxviii.*

⁵ Collectan. de reb. Hibernic. No. v. p. 64.

⁶ Ol. Rudbeck. *Atlant. P. ii. c. v. p. 140.*

⁷ Ayeen Akbery, and Maurice's *Antiquities of India*, vol. v. p. 1075.

⁸ Moxque per arduentes stipulas crepitanis acervos
Trajicias celeri strenua nimbria pede.

Expositus mos est: moris mihi restat origo.

Turba facit dubium; ceptaque nostra tēnet.

40^{*} *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

168. It must, however, be admitted that the Carthaginians and other nations of antiquity did occasionally sacrifice their children to their gods, in the most cruel and barbarous manner; and, indeed, there is scarcely any people whose history does not afford some instances of such abominable rites. Even the patriarch Abraham, when ordered to sacrifice his only son, does not appear to have been surprised or startled at it; neither could Jephtha have had any notion that such sacrifices were odious or even unacceptable to the Deity, or he would not have considered his daughter as included in his general vow, or imagined that a breach of it in such an instance could be a greater crime than fulfilling it. Another mode of mystic purification was the Taurobolium, Ægobolium, or Criobolium of the Mithraic rites; which preceded Christianity but a short time in the Roman empire, and spread and flourished with it. The catechumen was placed in a pit covered with perforated boards; upon which the victim, whether a bull, a goat, or a ram, was sacrificed so as to bathe him in the blood which flowed from it. To this the compositions, so frequent in the sculptures of the third and fourth centuries, of Mithras the Persian Mediator, or his female personification a winged Victory, sacrificing a bull, seem to allude: but all that we have seen are of late date, except a single instance of the Criobolium or Victory sacrificing a ram, on a gold coin of Abydos, in the cabinet of Mr. Payne Knight, which appears anterior to the Macedonian conquest.

169. The celestial or ætherial soul was represented in symbolical writing by the butterfly; an insect which first appears from the egg in the shape of a grub, crawling upon the earth, and feeding upon the leaves of plants. In this state it was aptly made an emblem of man in his earthly form; when the ætherial vigor and activity of the celestial soul, the *divinæ particula mentis*, was clogged and encumbered with the material body. In its next state, the grub becoming a chrysalis appeared, by its stilness, torpor, and insensibility, a natural image of death, or

c
Omnia purgat edax ignis, vitiumque metallis
Excoquit: idcirco cum duce purget oves.
An, quia cunctarum contraria semina rerum
Sunt duo, discordes ignis et unda dei;
Junxerunt elementa patres: aptumque putarunt
Ignibus, et sparsa tangere corpus aqua?
An, quod in his vitæ caussa est, hæc perdidit exul:
His nova fit conjux: hæc duo magna putant?

Ovid. *Fast.* lib. iv. 781.

^{*} See Bassirel di Roma, *ta.* l. viii.-lx. &c.

the intermediate state between the cessation of the vital functions of the body, and the emancipation of the soul in the funeral pile: and the butterfly breaking from this torpid chrysalis, and mounting in the air, afforded a no less natural image of the celestial soul bursting from the restraints of matter, and mixing again with its native æther. Like other animal symbols, it was by degrees melted into the human form; the original wings only being retained, to mark its meaning. So elegant an allegory would naturally be a favorite subject of art among a refined and ingenious people; and it accordingly appears to have been more diversified and repeated by the Greek sculptors, than almost any other, which the system of emanations, so favorable to art, could afford. Being, however, a subject more applicable and interesting to individuals than communities, there is no trace of it upon any coin, though it so constantly occurs upon gems.

170. The fate of the terrestrial soul, the regions to which it retired at the dissolution of the body, and the degree of sensibility which it continued to enjoy, are subjects of much obscurity, and seem to have belonged to the poetry, rather than to the religion, of the ancients. In the *Odyssey* it is allowed a mere miserable existence in the darkness of the polar regions, without any reward for virtue or punishment for vice; the punishments described being evidently allegorical, and perhaps of a different, though not inferior author. The mystic system does not appear to have been then known to the Greeks, who caught glimmering lights and made up incoherent fables from various sources. Pindar, who is more systematic and consistent in his mythology than any other poet, speaks distinctly of rewards and punishments; the latter of which he places in the central cavities of the earth, and the former in the remote islands of the ocean, on the other side of the globe; to which none were admitted, but souls that had transmigrated three times into different bodies, and lived piously in each; after which they were to enjoy undisturbed happiness in this state of ultimate bliss, under the mild rule of Rhadamanthus, the associate of *KPONOΣ* or Time.¹ A similar region of bliss in the extremities of the earth is spoken of in the *Odyssey*; but not as the retreat of the dead, but a

¹ *Olymp. ii. 108—123. &c.*

Τοισι δὲ λαμπρὴ μὲν μῆνος αἰθέριον τὰν ἐνθάδε τυκτα κατὰ. Id. apud Plutarch. de Cons. ad Apoll. in ed. Heyn. Pind. inter *ᾠδ. c. threnis. i.*

42 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

country which Menelaus was to visit while living.¹ Virgil has made up an incoherent mixture of fable and allegory, by bringing the regions of recompense, as well as those of punishment, into the centre of the earth; and then giving them the ætherial light of the celestial luminaries,² without which even his powers of description could not have embellished them to suit their purpose. He has, also, after Plato,³ joined Tartarus to them, though it was not part of the regions regularly allotted to the dead by the ancient Greek mythologists; but a distinct and separate world beyond chaos, as far from earth, as earth from heaven.⁴ According to another poetical idea, the higher parts of the sublunary regions were appropriated to the future residence of the souls of the great and good, who alone seemed deserving of immortality.⁵

171. Opinions so vague and fluctuating had of course but little energy; and accordingly we never find either the hope of reward, or the fear of punishment after death, seriously employed by the Greek and Roman moralists as reasonable motives for human actions; or considered any otherwise than as matters of pleasing speculation or flattering error.⁶ Among the barbarians of the North, however, the case was very different. They all implicitly believed that their valor in this life was to be rewarded in the next, with what they conceived to be the most exquisite of all possible enjoyments. Every morning they were to fight a great and promiscuous battle; after which Odin was to restore the killed and wounded to their former strength and vigor, and provide a sumptuous entertainment for them in his hall, where they were to feed upon the flesh of a wild boar, and drink mead and ale out of the skulls of their enemies till night, when they were to be indulged with beautiful women.⁷ Mankind in general

¹ *Odys.* Δ. 561.

² *Solemque suum, sua sidera norunt.* *Æn.* vi. 641.

³ *Phæd.* p. 88.

⁴ ——— Περὶν Χάος ζοφειροία. *Hesiod. Theog.* v. 720.

Τοσσην ενερθ' αἰδω, δασον ουρανός τας' απο γαιης. *Homer. Il.* Θ.

Milton's Hell is taken from the Tartarus of Hesiod, or whoever was the author of the Theogony which bears his name. • His descriptions of Chaos are also drawn from the same source.

⁵ *Quæ niger astriferis connectitur axibus æer,
Quodque patet terras interlunæque meatus,
Semidei manes habitant, quos ignea virtus
Innocuos vitæ patientes ætheris imi
Fecit, et æternos animam collegit in orbes.*

Lucan. Pharsal. ix. 6.

⁶ *Juvenal. Sat.* ii. 149. *Lucan. Phars.* 458.

⁷ Mallet *Introd.* à l'Hist. de Danemarck.

in all stages of society are apt to fashion their belief to their dispositions, and thus to make their religion a stimulus instead of a curb to their passions.¹

172. As fire was supposed to be the medium through which the soul passed from one state to another, Mercury the conductor was nearly related to Vulcan, the general personification of that element. The Egyptians called him his son;² and the Greeks, in some instances, represented him not only with the same cap, but also with the same features; so that they are only to be distinguished by the adscititious symbols.³ He has also, for the same reason, a near affinity with Hercules, considered as the personification of the diurnal sun: wherefore they were not only worshipped together in the same temple,⁴ but blended into the same figure, called a Hermheracles from its having the characteristic forms or symbols of both mixed.⁵

173. As the operations of both art and nature were supposed to be equally carried on by means of fire, Vulcan is spoken of by the poets, sometimes as the husband of Grace or Elegance,⁶ and sometimes of Venus or Nature;⁷ the first of which appears to have been his character in the primary, and the second in the mystic or philosophical religion of the Greeks: for the whole of the song of Demodocus in the *Odyssey*, here alluded to, is an interpolation of a much later date;⁸ and the story which it contains, of Vulcan detecting Mars and Venus, and confining them in invisible chains, evidently a mystic allegory, signifying the active and passive powers of destruction and generation fixed in their mutual operation by the invisible exertions of the universal agent, fire. It was probably composed as a hymn to Vulcan, and inserted by some rhapsodist, who did not understand the character of the Homeric language, with which the Attic contraction *Ἥλιος* for *Ἡλῖος* is utterly incompatible.

174. The Egyptian worship, being under the direction of a permanent Hierarchy, was more fixed and systematic than that of the Greeks; though, owing to its early subversion, we have less knowledge of it. Hence the different personifications of fire were by them more accurately discriminated; Pthas, whom the Greeks call Hephaistus, and the Latins Vulcan, being the primitive universal element, or principle of life and motion in matter; Anubis, whom they call Hermes and Mercury, the Mi-

¹ Syncell. Chron. p. 124.

² See coins of Æaernia, Lipara, &c.

³ Ἡρακλίου δὲ ποινὴ καὶ Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τῷ σταδίῳ τὰς. Paus.

⁴ Cicer. ad Attic. lib. i. ep. x.

⁵ Iliad 2. 382.

⁶ Odyss. 8. 266.

⁷ Odyss. 8. 266-369.

44 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

nister of Fate; and Thoth, whom they called by the same titles, the parent of Arts and Sciences. Phthas was said to be the father of all their Cabiri or chief gods;¹ and his name signified the Ordinator or Regulator, as it does still in the modern Coptic. His statues were represented lame, to signify that fire acts not alone, but requires the sustenance of some extraneous matter;² and he was fabled by the Greek mythologists to have delivered Minerva from the head of Jupiter; that is, to have been the means by which the wisdom of the omnipotent Father, the pure emanation of the Divine Mind, was brought into action.

175. This pure emanation, which the Ægyptians called Neith,³ was considered as the goddess both of Force and Wisdom, the first in rank of the secondary deities,⁴ and the only one endowed with all the attributes of the supreme Deity;⁵ for as wisdom is the most exalted quality of the mind, and the Divine Mind the perfection of wisdom, all its attributes are the attributes of wisdom; under whose direction its power is always exerted. Force and wisdom, therefore, when considered as attributes of the Deity, are the same; and Bellona and Minerva are but different titles for one personification. Both the Greeks and Ægyptians considered her as male and female;⁶ and upon monuments of art still extant, or accurately recorded, she is represented with almost every symbol of almost every attribute, whether of creation, preservation, or destruction.⁷

176. Before the human form was adopted, her proper symbol was the owl; a bird which seems to surpass all other creatures in acuteness and refinement of organic perception; its eye being calculated to discern objects, which to all others are enveloped in darkness; its ear to hear sounds distinctly, when no

¹ Herodot. lib. iii. 37.

² Jablonski Panth. Ægypt. lib. i. c. ii. s. 11 et 12.

³ Ἡ τῆς πολιῆς ἀρχηγὸς ἐστὶν Αἰγυπτιστὶ μὲν τοῦτομα Νηθ, Ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ, ὡς καὶ νῦν λόγος, Ἀθῆναι. Platon. Tim. p. 47d.

⁴ Proximos illi tamen occupavit

Pallas honores. Horat. lib. i. Ode xii.

⁵ ———— Ἐπὶ μῦθῳ Ζηνὸς τογὶ θυγατρὶν

Δωκὴν Ἀθαναιᾶ, πατρίῳα πάντα φερέσκει.

Callimach. εἰς λουτ. τῆς Παλλ. v. 132.

⁶ Ἀρσὴν καὶ θήλυς ἐφύε. Orph. Hymn. εἰς Ἀθην. Jablonsk. Panth. Ægypt. lib. i. c. iii. s. 6.

⁷ The celebrated statue of her at Athens by Phidias held a spear, near which was a serpent. Pausan. lib. i. c. xxiv. A sacred serpent was also kept in her great temple in the Acropolis. Aristoph. Lysistrat. v. 758.

Καὶ Ἀθῆνας (αγάλμα) ἐπὶ κλησὶν καὶ ταύτης Ὑγίας. Pausan. in Attic. c. xxiii. s. 6.

See also medals of Athens, in which almost every symbol occasionally accompanies the owl.

other can perceive them at all; and its nostrils to discriminate effluvia with such nicety, that it has been deemed prophetic from discovering the putridity of death, even in the first stages of disease.¹ On some very ancient Phœnician coins, we find the owl with the hook of attraction and winnow of separation under its wing to show the dominion of Divine Wisdom over both; while on the reverse is represented the result of this dominion, in the symbolical composition of a male figure holding a bow in his hand, sitting upon the back of a winged horse terminating in the tail of a dolphin; beneath which are waves and another fish.² A similar meaning was veiled under the fable of Minerva's putting the bridle into the mouth of Pegasus,³ or Divine Wisdom controlling and regulating the waters when endued with motion.

177. The Ægyptians are said to have represented the pervading Spirit or ruling providence of the Deity by the black beetle, which frequents the shores of the Mediterranean sea,⁴ and which some have supposed to be an emblem of the Sun.⁵ It occurs very frequently upon Phœnician, Greek, and Etruscan, as well as Ægyptian sculptures; and is sometimes with the owl, and sometimes with the head of Minerva; upon the small brass coins of Athens. It is of the androgynous class, and lays its eggs in a ball of dung or other fermentable matter, which it had previously collected, and rolled backwards and forwards upon the sand of the sea, until it acquired the proper form and consistency; after which it buries it in the sand, where the joint operation of heat and moisture matures and vivifies the germs into new insects.⁶ As a symbol, therefore, of the Deity, it might naturally have been employed to signify the attribute of Divine Wisdom, or ruling Providence, which directs, regulates, and employs the productive powers of nature.

178. When the animal symbols were changed for the human, Minerva was represented under the form of a robust female

¹ Of this we have known instances, in which the nocturnal clamors of the screech-owl have really foretold death, according to the vulgar notion.

² See Dutens Médailles Phénic. pl. i. v. i.

³ Pausan. lib. ii. c. iv.

⁴ Horapoll. l. i. c. x.

⁵ Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 380.*

⁶ Το δε καθαρον γένος ουκ εχουσιν θηλειαν, αρρενας δε παντας αφιναι τον γονον εις την σφαιροποιουμενην υλην, ην κυλιδουσιν αντιβαδην υποδιντες, ωσπερ δοκει τον ουρανον ο ηλιος εις τουναντιον περιστρεφειν, αυτος απο δυσμων επι τας ακαιτολας φερομενος. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

Τον δε ηλιον τω καθαρω (απεικμαζον οι φιλοσοφοι) επειδη κυκλοτερες εκ της βοειας ονθου σχημα πλασμενος, αντιπροσωπος κυλιδει· φασι και εξαμηνον μεν υπο γης θαπειναι δε του ιτους τμημα το ζων τουτο υπο γης διαιτασθαι, σπιρμαιναν τε εις την σφαιραν και γιγνην, κα. θηλυν κωλυον μη γινεσθαι. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. c. iv.

46 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

figure, with a severe, but elegant and intelligent countenance, and armed with a helmet, shield, and breast-plate, the emblems of preservation; and most frequently with a spear, the emblem, as well as the instrument, of destruction. The helmet is usually decorated with some animal symbol; such as the owl, the serpent, the ram, the gryphon, or the sphinx; which is a species of gryphon, having the head of the female personification, instead of that of the eagle, upon the body of the lion. Another kind of gryphon, not unfrequent upon the helmets of Minerva, is composed of the eagle and horse,¹ signifying the dominion of water instead of fire: whence came the symbol of the flying horse, already noticed. In other instances the female head and breast of the sphinx are joined to the body of a horse; which, in these compositions is always male, as well as that of the lion in the sphinx; so as to comprehend the attributes of both sexes.² In the stand of a mirror of very ancient sculpture belonging to Mr. Payne Knight is a figure of Isis upon the back of a monkey with a sphinx on each side of her head, and another in her hand, the tail of which terminates in a phallus; so that it is a compound symbol of the same kind as the chimæra and others before noticed. The monkey very rarely occurs in Greek sculptures, but was a sacred animal among the Egyptians, as it still continues to be in some parts of Tartary and India; but on account of what real or imaginary property is now uncertain.

179. The ægis or breast-plate of Minerva is, as the name indicates, the goat-skin, the symbol of the productive power, fabled to have been taken from the goat which suckled Jupiter; that is, from the great nutritive principle of nature. It is always surrounded with serpents, and generally covered with plumage; and in the centre of it is the Gorgo or Medusa, which appears to have been a symbol of the Moon,³ exhibited sometimes with the character and expression of the destroying, and sometimes with those of the generative or preserving attribute; the former of which is expressed by the title of Gorgo, and the latter by that of Medusa.⁴ It is sometimes represented with serpents, and sometimes with fish, in the hair; and occasionally with al-

¹ See Medals of Velia, &c.

² Hence the *ανδροσφιγγις* of Herodotus, lib. ii.

³ Γοργονιον την σεληνην δια το εν αυτη προσωπον. Orph. in Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. p. 675.

⁴ ΓΟΡΓΩ is said to have been a barbarian title of Minerva, as ΒΕΝΔΕΙΑ and ΔΙΚΤΥΝΝΑ were of Diana. Palæphat. lib. xxxii. ΜΕΔΟΥΣΑ is the participle of the verb ΜΕΔΩ to govern or take care of. In a beautiful intaglio, the work of Anteros, belonging to Mr. Payne Knight, Perseus sustains the Medusa in his hand, while the Gorgo occupies the centre of a shield, on which he rests his harpè.

most every symbol of the passive generative or productive power; it being the female personification of the Disk, by which almost all the nations of antiquity represented the Sun;¹ and this female personification was the symbol of the Moon. Among the Romans, the golden bulla or disk was worn by the young men, and the crescent by the women, as it still is in the South of Italy; and it seems that the same symbolical amulets were in use among the ancient inhabitants of the British islands; several of both having been found made of thin beaten gold both in England and Ireland; which were evidently intended to be hung round the neck.² Each symbol, too, occasionally appears worn in like manner upon the figures of Juno or Ceres, which cannot always be discriminated; and the Disk between horns, which seem to form a crescent, is likewise upon the head of Isis and Osiris, as well as upon those of their animal symbols, the cow and bull.³

180. The ægis employed occasionally by Jupiter, Minerva, and Apollo, in the Iliad, seems to have been something very different from the symbolical breast-plate or thorax, which appears in monuments of art now extant; it being borne and not worn; and used to excite courage or instil fear, and not for defence.⁴ The name Ægis, however, still seems to imply that it is derived from the same source and composed of the same material; though instead of serpents, or other symbolical ornaments, it appears to have been decorated with golden tassels or knobs hanging loosely from it; the shaking and rattling of which produced the effects above mentioned.⁵ Vulcan is said to have

¹ See authorities before cited.

Παιονίς σίβουσι τον 'Ηλιον' αγαλμα δε 'Ηλιου Παιονικοί διςκος βρωχες ὑπερ μακρου ξυλου. Max. Tyr. Dissert. viii.

² One three inches in diameter, found in the Isle of Man, is in the collection of Mr. Payne Knight, and another, found in Lancashire, in that of the late C. Townley, esq.

³ Μεταξυ δε των κυριων, οπου ἄλλου κυκλος μιμηματος επιστι χρυσειος· εστι δε ἡ 'βους ορθη, ἀλλ' ἐν γούνασι κειμένη. Herodot. lib. ii. 132.

⁴ ———— Μετα δε γλαυκωπις Αθηνη,

Αιγιδ' ἔχουσ' ἐρετιμας

Συν τη παρυσσούσα διςσυστο λαον Ἀχαιων,
Οτρυνουσα' ἔργα· ἐν δε σθῆνος ὤρεσιν ἱκαστου
Καρδίη, ἀλλήλοισι πολεμίζειν, ἠδὲ μαχισθαι.
Ζευς δε σφιν Κρονίδης, ὑψίζυγος, αἰθιρι ναιων,
Αὐτος ἐπισσειησιν ἐριμένη Αἰγίδα πασι
Της δ' ἀπατης κοτιων. Δ. 166.

B. 446.

See also O. 308 and 318.¹

⁵ Αιγιδ' ἔχουσ' ἐριθίμους, ἀγρηαρον, ἀθανασην τε
Της ἱκατον θυτανοι παγχρυσοι κηδεύοντο,
Παντες ἐπιδικτες· ἱκατομβοιοι· δι' ἱκαστος. B. 447.

48 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

made it for Jupiter;¹ and to have furnished it with all those terrific attributes, which became so splendid and magnificent when personified in poetry.

181. Stripped, however, of all this splendor and magnificence, it was probably nothing more than a symbolical instrument, signifying originally the motion of the elements, like the sistrum of Isis, the cymbals of Cybele,² the bells of Bacchus, &c.; whence Jupiter is said to have overcome the Titans with his ægis, as Isis drove away Typhon with her sistrum;³ and the ringing of bells and clatter of metals were almost universally employed as a mean of consecration, and a charm against the destroying and inert powers.⁴ Even the Jews welcomed the new Moon with such noises;⁵ which the simplicity of the early æges employed almost everywhere to relieve her during eclipses, supposed then to be morbid affections brought on by the influence of an adverse power. The title Priapus, by which the generative attribute is distinguished, seems to be merely a corruption of *BPIA-ΠΤΟΣ* *clamorous*; the *B* and *Π* being commutable letters, and epithets of similar meaning being continually applied both to Jupiter and Bacchus by the poets.⁶ Many priapic figures, too, still extant, have bells attached to them;⁷ as the symbolical statues and temples of the Hindoos have; and to wear them was a part of the worship of Bacchus among the Greeks;⁸ whence we sometimes find them of extremely small size, evidently meant to be worn as amulets with the phalli, lunulæ, &c. The chief priests of the Ægyptians, and also the high priest of the Jews,

¹ ————— Εχε δ' αιγιδα θουριν
Δεινην, αμφιδασειαν, αριπρεπε', ην αρα χαλκευς
Ἥφαιστος Διι δωκε φορημειναι ες φοβον ανδρων. O. 308.

Αμφι δ' αρ' ωμοισιν βαλειτ' αιγιδα θυσαυνοισσαν
Δεινην, ην περι μεν παντη φοβος ιστεφανωται·
Εν δ' Ερις, εν δ' Αλκη, εν δε κρυοισσα Ιωκη·
Εν δε τι Γοργειη κεφαλη δεινοιο πελωρου,
Δεινη τε, σμερδνη τε, Διος τερας αιγιοχοιο. E. 738.

² Ζοι μεν καταρχαι, Ματιρ, παρα
Μεγαλοι ρομβοι κυμβαλων. Pindar. ap. Strab. lib. x. p. 719.

³ Τον γαρ Τυφωνα φασι τοις σιστρηις αποτρεπειν και ανακρουεσθαι, δηλουντες, οτι της φθορας συνδιουσης και ιστασης, αυθις αναλυει την φυσιν, και ανιστησι δια της κνησιως η γινεισις. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

⁴ Schol. in Theocrit. Idyl. ii. 36.

————— Temesæaque concrepat æra,

Et rogat ut tectis exeat umhra suis. Ovid. Fast. v. 441.

⁵ Numer. c. x. v. 10.

⁶ Such as εριβριμειτης, εριγδουπος, βρομιος, &c.

⁷ Bronzi d' Ercolano, t. vi. tav. xcvi.

⁸ Διονυσιακον δε ——— τους βασιλεις κωδωνοφορεσθαι, και τυμπανιζισθαι κατα τας δεξοδους. Megasthen. apud Strab. lib. xv. p. 712.

hung them, as sacred emblems, to their sacerdotal garments;¹ and the Bramins still continue to ring a small bell at the intervals of their prayers, ablutions, and other acts of mystic devotion. The Lacedæmonians beat upon a brass vessel or pan, on the death of their kings;² and we still retain the custom of tolling a bell on such occasions; though the reason of it is not generally known, any more than that of other remnants of ancient ceremonies still existing.³

182. An opinion, very generally prevailed among the ancients, that all the constituent parts of the great machine of the universe were mutually dependent upon each other; and that the luminaries of heaven, while they contributed to fecundate and organise terrestrial matter, were in their turn nourished and sustained by exhalations drawn from the humidity of the earth and its atmosphere. Hence the Egyptians placed the personifications of the Sun and Moon in boats;⁴ while the Greeks, among whom the horse was a symbol of humidity, placed them in chariots, drawn sometimes by two, sometimes by three, and sometimes by four of these animals; which is the reason of the number of Bigæ, Trigæ, and Quadrigæ, which we find upon coins: for they could not have had any reference to the public games, as has been supposed; a great part of them having been struck by states, which, not being of Hellenic origin, had never the privilege of entering the lists on those occasions. The vehicle itself appears likewise to have been a symbol of the passive generative power, or the means by which the emanations of the Sun acted; whence the Delphians called Venus by the singular title of 'The Chariot';⁵ but the same meaning is more frequently expressed by the figure called a Victory accompanying; and by the fish, or some other symbol of the waters under it. In some instances we have observed composite symbols signifying both attributes in this situation; such as the lion destroying the bull,

¹ Plutarch. Symposiac. lib. iv. qu. 5. Exod. c. xxviii.

² Schol. in Theocrit. l. c.

³ "It is said," says the Golden Legend by Wynkyn de Worde, "the evil spirytes that ben in the regyon of th' ayre doute moche when they here the belles rongen: and this is the cause why the belles ben rongen when it thondreth, and when grete tempeste and outrages of wether happen, to the end that the feindes and wycked spirytes shold be abashed and flee, and cease of the movving of the tempeste." p. 90.

Εκείνα μιν γὰρ (τα φασμάτα) ἦν φόβον ἔκρουσεν χαλκοῦ ἢ σιδήρου πεφειγέ. Lucian. Philops. 15.

⁴ Ἡλιον δὲ καὶ σιληνην οὐχ ἄρμασιν ἀλλὰ πλοίοις οὐχημασὶ χρωμένους περιπλῖν αἰι, αἰνιττομένοι τὴν ἀφ' ὕψους τροφὴν αὐτῶν καὶ φινεῖσιν. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir.

⁵ Οὐτε Διόφους ἰλιγγεῖ ληρουτὰς, ὅτι τὴν Ἀφροδίτῃ ἄρμα χαλουσιν. Plutarch. Anator. p. 760.

or the Scylla; which is a combination of emblems of the same kind as those which compose the sphinx and chimæra, and has no resemblance whatever to the fabulous monster described in the Odyssey.

183. Almost every other symbol is occasionally employed as an accessory to the chariot, and among them the thunderbolt; which is sometimes borne by Minerva and other deities, as well as by Jupiter; and is still oftener represented alone upon coins; having been an emblem, not merely of the destroying attribute, but of the Divine nature in general: whence the Arcadians sacrificed to thunder, lightning, and tempest;² and the incarnate Deity, in an ancient Indian poem, says, "I am the thunderbolt."—"I am the fire residing in the bodies of all things which have life."³ In the South-Eastern parts of Europe, which frequently suffer from drought, thunder is esteemed a grateful rather than terrific sound, because it is almost always accompanied with rain; which scarcely ever falls there without it.⁴ This rain, descending from ignited clouds, was supposed to be impregnated with electric or ætherial fire, and therefore to be more nutritive and prolific than any other water:⁵ whence the thunderbolt was employed as the emblem of fecundation and nutrition, as well as of destruction. The coruscations which accompany its explosions being thought to resemble the glimmering flashes which proceed from burning sulphur; and the smell of the fixed air arising from objects stricken by it being the same as that which arises from the mineral, men were led to believe that its fires were of a sulphurous nature:⁶ wherefore the flames of sulphur were employed in all lustrations, purifications, &c.,⁷ as having an affinity with divine or ætherial fire; to which its name

¹ See coins of Agrigentum, Heraclea in Italy, Allifa, &c. *

² Καὶ θουοὶ αὐτοὶ ἀστραπαὶς, καὶ θυίλλαις, καὶ βρονταῖς. Pausan. lib. vii. c. 29.

³ Bagvat Geeta, p. 86 and 113.

Αἱ ἡμετέρας ψυχὰς πυρ ἴσσι. Phurnut. de Nat. Deor. c. ii.

⁴ *Grateful as thunder in summer*, is a simile of Tasso's; who, notwithstanding his frequent and close imitations of the ancients, has copied nature more accurately than any Epic poet except Homer.

⁵ Τα δ' ἀστραπαῖα τῶν ὕδατων ὑπερδὴ καλοῦσιν οἱ γηγῆνοι, καὶ τομιζοῦσι. — τῆς βρονταῖς πολλὰς αἰὶνὰ συσπικπτεῖ γονιμον αἰτία δι' ἣ τῆς θερμότητος ἀναμῖξις. — το κεραυνὸν πυρ ἀκριβεῖα καὶ λεπτοῦντι θαυμάσων ἐστὶ. Plutarch. Symposiac. lib. iv. qu. 2.

⁶ Ἀφῆκ' ἀργητὰ κεραυνὸν

Δεῖν δὲ φλογ' ὥρτο θείοιο καίομενός. Iliad. Θ.

⁷ — Cuprent lustrari, si qua darentur

*Sulphura cum tædis, et si foret humida laurus.

Juvenal. Sat. ii. v. 157.

in the Greek language has been supposed to refer.¹ To represent the thunderbolt, the ancient artists joined two obelisks pointing contrary ways from one centre, with spikes or arrows diverging from them; thus signifying its luminous essence and destructive power. Wings were sometimes added, to signify its swiftness and activity; and the obelisks were twisted into spiral forms, to show the whirl in the air caused by the vacuum proceeding from the explosion; the origin of which, as well as the productive attribute,² was signified by the aquatic plants, from which they sprang.³

DEFENCE OF PLAGIARISM.

MUCH has lately been said respecting the plagiarisms of Lord Byron; and reference has been made to compositions, in prose more particularly, to prove the case against him. I am inclined to doubt the fairness of that criticism. Are not the mightiest productions of genius effected by comparison, by combining impressions made on the mind by external objects, or by resources originally emanating from the labors and writings of others, and from historical facts and relations? Nor can I easily be persuaded that the last are not legitimate sources of composition, when I consider that to them we either are, or appear to be, indebted for the noblest poems. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer are, with every presumption of truth, supposed to be founded on historical facts, highly embellished with the ornaments of poetry, and owing many of their graces to the fictions of imagination. Yet could we believe, as some have endeavoured to maintain, that the war of Troy and the whole series of events and circumstances connected with it never existed but in the mind of the poet, I doubt whether the bard would be at all raised in our estimation

¹ Οἱ μὲν καὶ το θεῖον ὑπομασθαι τῇ ὁμοιοτητι τῆς σφμης, ἢν τὰ παλαιὰ τοῖς κεραινοῖς ἀφῆσιν. Plutarch. Symposiac. lib. iv. qu. 2.

² See coins of Syracuse, Seleucia, Alexander I. king of Epirus, Elis, &c. Upon some of the most ancient of the latter, however, it is more simply composed of flames only, diverging both ways.

by such an admission. The *Æneid* is not only founded on historical facts and relations connected with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but is largely indebted to them for its poetical embellishments, for its fictitious graces, and for the construction of its plan, and on many occasions copies the incidents, if not the language, of Homer. The tragedies of the ancients are generally composed from the writings of that great poet, or from historical circumstances of Grecian history, either transmitted in writing, or subjects of traditional relation at the time. And assuredly a poem, which has reality for its basis and support, and which is adorned and ennobled by the imagination of the poet with all the variety of fictitious ornament and all the charms of composition, ought not to be less interesting or praiseworthy than what is merely fabulous. What says Horace?

Publica materies privati juris erit, si
Nec circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem ;
Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus
Interpres ; nec desilies imitator in arctum,
Unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex.

And his poems abound in references and allusions to the writings of Homer, Euripides, and Pindar, with not unfrequent imitations and occasional plagiarisms, since we must so call them, from those immortal bards.

In the *Supplices* of Euripides occurs the following passage :

χρῆν γὰρ οὔτε σώματα ·
"Αδिका δικαίοις τὸν σοφὸν συμμιγνύναι,
Εὐδαιμονοῦντας δ' εἰς φόβους κτᾶσθαι φίλους.
Κοινὰς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰς τύχας ἡγούμενος,
Τοῖς τοῦ νοσοῦντος πῆμασιν διώλεσεν
Τὸν οὐ νοσοῦντα, κοῦδὲν ἡδίκηκότα.

The second Ode of the third book of Horace has towards its termination the following sentence :

' Vetabo quæ Cereris sacrum
Vulgârit arcanum sub iisdem
Sit trabihus, fragilemque mecum
Solvat phaselum. Sæpe Diespiter
Neglectus incesto addidit intégrum.'

A strong analogy may be traced in both, and an almost literal translation in one part. The case stands nearly thus. . Adrastus solicits the aid of Theseus in recovering the bodies of the Argive leaders slain under the walls of Thebes. Theseus, after a beautiful dissertation on the

bounty of Providence, in bestowing on man the gifts of speech and knowledge, the fruits of the earth, the benefits of commerce, the means of ascertaining things unknown by the inspection of entrails and the flight of birds, upbraids Adrastus as belonging to that class of mortals, who deem themselves wiser than the gods, because in misinterpretation of the oracle of Apollo, which had pronounced that he should give them to a lion and a boar, he had married his daughters to Tydeus and Polynices, and thus ruined the fortunes of his house by espousing them to strangers (here Musgrave prefers *ὡς χρωμένων θεῶν* to *ὡς ζώντων θεῶν*). It became not a wise man to unite pure with impure blood, but rather to secure friends enjoying the favor of Heaven, of whose assistance he might avail himself in time of fear or danger; for that God, or Jupiter, who governs the common fortunes of mankind, was apt to confound in the same destruction him not laboring under any divine malediction, and who had committed no injustice, with him whose guilt had rendered him obnoxious to punishment.

Horace, in the true spirit of a lyric bard, quits the commendation of valor and patriotism, which open a path to Heaven for those deserving immortality, and says that faithful silence also has its reward—silence in affairs of state, it is presumed he means; and goes on to say: “I will forbid him who violates the sacred mysteries of Ceres, or the religion of silence, to remain under the same roof, or to loosen the fragile bark with me. Often Jupiter neglected has added the innocent to the guilty.” It is evident that Horace had in view the sentiment of the dramatist. He would not unite pure with impure blood, nor for a moment trust himself in company with one who had rendered himself obnoxious to punishment by violating the mysteries of Ceres. There would be peril in being under the same roof with such a person; and to embark with him on the same vessel would be to augment the perils of a voyage, as from him only contamination was to be expected, not assistance in time of difficulty or danger.—Then comes the more immediate and palpable imitation. “Often Jupiter has added the innocent to the guilty.” The Latin expressions *integrum* and *incesto* are not susceptible of a literal translation, and bear a closer affinity to *τοῦ νοσοῦντος* and to *οὐ νοσοῦντα* than those which I have used; and *νοσοῦντος* *ἡμῶν* must be translated with a reference to those calamities to which the off-

spring of Œdipus were rendered obnoxious by their father's guilt.

The 12th Ode of Horace Book the 1st begins :

'Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
Tibia sumes celebrare Clio?
Quem Deum? Cujus recinet jocosa
Nomen Imago?'

The Carmen II. of Pindar commences thus :

'Αναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι,
Τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα,
Τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;

Here the imitation is too close to require tracing; but it is otherwise in the following example, where the resemblance exists rather in the sentiment and turn of thought than in the expressions; and is perhaps attributable to the prevalence of Grecian literature in the mind of the poet, and his intimate acquaintance with the dramatic writers in particular. And it is probable that he was unconscious from what source he had drawn the lines referred to at the time of their composition. I allude to the sentiments put into the mouth of Hecuba in the Troades of Euripides, who had previously expressed her apprehension of being carried as a slave of the detested Helen, the cause of the overthrow of Troy, to the banks of the Eurotas, rather than to the more fortunate regions now described.

Τὰν Πηνειοῦ σεμνὰν χώραν,
Κρητῖδ' Ὀλύμπου καλλίσταν,
Ὅλβω βριθεῖν φάμαν ἤκου-
σ' εὐθαλεῖ τ' εὐκαρπία.
Τάδε δεύτερά μοι μετὰ τὰν ἱερὰν
Θησέως ζαθέαν χώραν.
Καὶ τὰν Αἰτναίαν Ἠφαίστου,
Φοινίκας ἀντήρη χώραν,
Σικελῶν ὀρέων ματέρ' ἀκούω,
Κηρύσσεσθαι, στεφανοῖς τ' ἀρετάς,
Τὰν τ' ἀγχιστεύουσιν γὰρ
Ἰονίῳ ναίεσθαι πόντῳ, &c.

Horace, in the 6th Ode of his second Book, addresses Septimius in a strain of regret, when they were preparing to accompany Augustus on an expedition, that they were to incur the perils and privations of a voyage to Spain and the chance of being engulfed in the Syrtes, then indulging the desire of his heart in these beautiful stanzas :

Tibur Argæo positum colono
 Sit meæ sedes utinam senectæ ;
 Sit modus lasso maris et viarum
 Militiæque :
 Unde si Parcæ prohibent iniquæ ;
 Dulce pellitis ovibus Galesi
 Flumen, et regnata petam Laconi
 Rura Phalanto.
 Ille terrarum mihi præter omnes
 Angulus fidet, ubi non Hymetto
 Mella decedunt, viridique certat
 Bacca Venafro, &c.

Although the imitation here is not servile, the line of thought and turn of expression is similar ; and I cannot doubt that the lyric bard was indebted in this instance to the choral strains of the dramatist.

Other instances may doubtless be adduced. Then ought we eagerly to convict Lord Byron, who has a right to claim originality of genius as much as most English poets, because he may occasionally have borrowed from writers ancient or modern ; or can we pretend too severely to criticise even that more servile imitator Gray for having done what the acknowledged master in the art of poetry did not scruple to do before him ? Gray may perhaps be accused of being too close a copyist, trusting little to his own powers, and building the structure of his celebrity on the authority of others. A line of conduct which may be said to argue want of confidence rather than sterility of genius. Take the following example :

To each his sufferings, all are men
 Condemn'd alike to groan,
 The tender for another's pain,
 Th' unfeeling for his own !

Ἡ πολύμοχθον ἄρ' ἦν γένος,

Ἡ πολύμοχθον ἀμερίων ;

Χρῶν δέ τι

Δύσποτμον ἀνδράσιν ἀνευρεῖν ;

Euripides, Iphig. in Aulis.

G. C. F.

SYMBOLÆ CRITICÆ

AD CICERONIS DISPUTATIONUM TUSCULANARUM LIB. I

CAP. II. §. 4. *Summam eruditionem Græci sitarum censebant in nervorum vocumque cantibus: igitur et Epaminondas—fidibus præclare cecinisse dicitur; Themistoclesque aliquot ante annis, quum in epulis recusasset lyram, habitus est indoctior.*] Non ejusdem significationis sunt hæc duo: *ante multos annos*, et *multis ante annis*. Illud ita dictum esse constat, ut statim a præsentis tempore retro numeremus ætatem, (ut in hoc: *Ante multos eum vidi annos*) hoc autem hunc in modum, ut res non ad præsens sed ad præteritum tempus referatur (velut in his: *Decem ante annis aliud egi, aliud tribus annis post*). Quapropter lectionem vulg., quam Ernestius retinuit, *aliquot ante annos* correxit Wolfius sic: *aliquot ante annis*. Ceterum tirones sciant, *aliquot annos* sæpe esse satis longam annorum seriem, ut *aliquantum* et *aliquanto* didicerunt significare bonam partem.

Cap. III. §. 6. *In quo eo magis nobis est elaborandum, dum, quod multi jam esse Latini libri dicuntur scripti inconsiderate, ab optimis Illi quidem viris, sed non satis eruditis.*] In editione priori Wolfius retinuit *Illis*, pro quo Ernestius jam maluit *illi*, ut ad libros pertineret. Defendebat autem Wolfius lectionem vulgatam sic: primum, *quidem* post pronomen *illis* positum esse traiectione quadam pro hac formula loquendi: *Ab optimis quidem illis viris, sed non satis eruditis*; deinde, multa esse Ciceronis loca, ubi ille sine honoris testificatione positum reperiatur, ut iste non semper cum contempnitionis significatione, quanquam utrumque proprie ita ponatur. Tamen in altera editione recepit conjecturam *illi*, oblitus notare lectionis Ernestianæ diversitatem: nam in textu quidem Ernestius reliquerat *illis*. Nobis quoque h. l. magis placet *Illi*. Sic Tusc. III. 4. §. 11. *Græci volunt illi quidem, sed parum valent verbo.*

Eadem §. *Quare si aliquid Oratoriæ Laudis nostra attulimus industria.*] In Ernestii editione scriptum legitur: *si aliquid Oratoriæ Laudis*. At nullus exstat in Cicerone locus, ubi artem oratoriam simpliciter dixerit *Oratoriam*, licet artem

poëticam simpliciter dicat *Poëticam*. E Quintiliani Institut. Or. II. 14 patet, non potuisse Ciceronem scribere simpliciter *Oratoria*. *Laus oratoria* alijs etiam locis dicit, ut *laus imperatoria*. Hinc Wolfius scripsit *Oratoriæ* remota majuscula littera initiali. Ernestium quidem sibi non constare deprehendi, qui in textu reliquerit *Oratoriæ*, quasi de arte sermo sit, in annotatione autem de laude oratoria loquatur. Idem Genitivum *laudis* defendit non bene, ut jam defendisse animadverto Thomam Wopkens. Lectt. Tull. p. 49. Nam verbum *afferre* reperitur illud quidem sine Dativo, ut si dicas: *moram offert* (conf. Cic. pro Sext. 61) et similia. Hoc tamen loco durius omisum esset *Romanis*. Dativus *oratoriæ laudi* quum non sit Davisii conjectura, sed in edd. vet. occurrat, recte eum Wolfius prætulit, ut in Epistola ad Davisium Rich. Bentleius.

Cap. IV. §. 7. *Aristoteles, vir summo ingenio, Scientia, Cópia*] Jure probat hanc Wolfii lectionem (quam reperio etiam in ed. Oxon. a. 1783, T. II. p. 335) Censor peritissimus in Ephemeridibus litterariis Jenensibus (A. L. Z. a. 1792 no. 113), quem Schützius esse, quod illo jam anno quo prodiit censura videre mihi videbar, locis non paucis confirmavit mihi comparatio editionis Schütziæ. Quæ lectionem Wolfianam secuta, duplicem quibus illa nititur rationem non attulit. Scil. *scientiæ copia* Ciceroniano quidem loquendi usu non reperitur: *doctrinæ* vel *eruditionis copiam* rectissime dixeris. Est etiam male *ἀσύνδετος* lectio vulg. Sunt quidem exempla copulæ in duobus tantum verbis omisæ: sed nonnisi ubi est emphasis quædam, qualis h. l. nulla. Ceterum *admirabilem quandam scientiam et copiam* Aristoteli Cicero tribuit Orat. I. §. 5.

Cap. V. §. 9. verba a Wolfio non sollicitata, quæ et mihi a Ciceronis ratione videntur non esse aliena *Moriendum est enim omnibus* ad glossemata releganda esse suspicatur Censor ille. In editione tamen Schützius h. l. nihil monuit.

Cap. VI. §. 11. *contra ista ipsa Disserentium Philosophorum.*] Sic e codd. quibusdam dedit Wolfius pro lectione vulg. *Philosophorum Disserentium*. In qua trajectio nimia esse videtur. Utuntur quidem interdum veteres scriptores trajectionibus quibus durities aliqua inest. Sed quum libri non consentiant, commodiorem structuram Wolfius recepit. Neque est clausula hexametri *philosophorum*: nam prima syllaba brevis.

Ibid. *ita ne miseri quidem.*] *Sunt* delendum quidem putabat Ernestius, non deservit. Qui quam affert causam cur delendum sit, nulla est. Est autem propter sententiam expungendum; ut jam monuit Bentleius, quem secuti sunt Wolfius et Schützius.

Male locum supplevit qui adscripsit *sunt*. Subintelligendum est *possunt esse*. Conf. §. 14. *Quoniam extorsisti, ut faterer, qui omnino non essent, eos ne miseros quidem esse posse.*

Cap. VIII. §. 17. *Quid? si te rogacero aliquid, non respondebis?*] Sic edidit Wolfius, quem secutus est Schützius; recte. Nam si in priori parte propositionis interrogativæ negatio ponitur, nonne dici solet; si vero rejicitur negatio ad extremam propositionem, tum *non* adhibetur. Plerumque certe sic dici solet. Ut supra cap. VII. §. 13. *Pugnantia te loqui, non vides?* Et c. XV. §. 34: *Nonne in his ipsis libris, quos scribunt de contemnenda gloria, sua nomina inscribunt?* Ceterum nostro loco etiam Boherius legi jubebat *non respondebis*, laudans Henr. Stephanum in *Pseudo-Cicerone* p. 138.

Cap. X. §. 20. *Ejus doctor Plato triplicem finxit animum*] Pro vulgata lectione *Animum* restituit Wolfius *Animam*. Correxerat jam Bentleius, addicentibus codicibus quibusdam; sed correxisse Bentleium Wolfius olim nobis præsentibus dicebat propterea, quia Græcam vocem $\psi\chi\eta$ non aliter putaret Latine verti potuisse quam *animum*, qua in re ille Wolfio iudice vehementer errabat. Nam $\psi\chi\eta$ esse et *animum* et *animam*, proprie autem esse *animam*, ductum a verbo aliquo quod notionem haberet spirandi, ita ut $\psi\chi\eta$ proprie sit *spiritus*. Sed ut hoc mittamus, (sic fere Wolfius pergebat) sane ambigua semper manet vox $\psi\chi\eta$. At, quod h. l. monendum erat, Plato ubi de $\psi\chi\eta$ tripartita loquitur, loqui non potest de *anima*, sed de *animo*. Ratio, ira, cupiditas, hæ tres animæ partes nullo modo pertinere possunt ad spiritum hominis, sed ad vim intelligendi, sentiendi, concupiscendi. Hæc vis autem *animus* dicitur, nunquam *anima*. Hoc igitur loco Cicero scripsit *animum*, quod et sequentia docent.—Acute sane et vere lectionem suam hunc fere in modum olim probasse mihi videtur Wolfius. Alia est quæstio, an Bentleius putaverit Græcum $\psi\chi\eta$ non aliter Latine verti potuisse quam *animum*. Disertis quidem verbis illud non dixit, sed hoc tautum: “De Animo hic disserit Cicero: Animæ autem vocabulum si quando hic usurpat, pro aëre accipit; ut paullo ante: *Animum autem alii animam, ut fere nostri*. Quare, ut evitetur ambiguum non sine crimine adscribendum, rescribo *triplicem finxit Animum*.”

In iis de Dicæarcho quæ sequuntur, vulgo quidem legitur *Animum vel animam*, uncis vero inclusit priori editione sua Wolfius *vel animam*, quia quum *anima* proprie sit *spiritus*, $\piνεῦμα$, eam vocem Cicero II. l. ponere non potuerit. De $\piνεῦματι$ enim dubitare Dicæarchum plane non potuisse.—Jam

Bentleius verba vel animam ejicienda h. l. censuit. Ejus autem rationes nihili esse judicabat Wolfius. Eum enim dicere, Dicæarchum sine dubio dixisse ψυχὴν, hoc autem verti non posse nisi *animum*. (Quod disertis verbis Bentleium dixisse, supra negavi.) Neque certum esse e Dicæarchi verbis, quod Bentleius voluit. Quid enim? si dixisset ille ψυχὴ ἢ πνεῦμα: num Cicero aliter dicere potuisset quam *animum vel animam*? (At sic Dicæarchum dicere potuisse Wolfius negaverat ipse. Ut igitur ab eo lectionis causam subtiliter olim redditam esse facile agnoscam, tamen ab ipsius ratione Bentleium prope abfuisse puto. Qui postquam dixisset, Ciceroni *animum* hic esse qui Græcis ψυχὴ: Quare, inquit, in hoc capite, ubi Dicæarchus opinionem sic refert: *Nihil esse omnino animum, et hoc esse totum inane, frustra que Animalia et Animantes appellari: neque enim in homine inesse animum vel animam, nec in bestia*: omnino auctor sum, ut verba illa *vel animam* ejiciantur, utpote a varia lectione marginali in textum intrusa. Nam in Græcis Dicæarchi non nisi unum vocabulum esse potuit ψυχὴ. Εἰκὴ λέγεσθαι "Εμφυχα" οὐδὲ γὰρ ὅλως ἐνεῖναι τὴν ψυχὴν οὐτ' ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, οὐτ' ἐν ἀλόγῳ ζῳῳ.) Restat ut commemorem, in recensione secundis curis emendatiore quæ prodiit. MDCCCVII. Wolfium verba *vel animam* sine uncis reposuisse, quod fecit etiam Schützius. Uterque me quidem non refragante. Nam de *anima*, quatenus sit πνεῦμα, dubitare plane non potuisse Dicæarchum, caveamus ne tale quid pronuntiemus. De cujus philosophi sententia, a Cicerone, ut videtur, non omni ex parte dilucide et haud scio annon satis recte exposita, conf. Tennemannii nostri, V. C., Hist. Philos. Tom. III. p. 336. Accedit, quod si scriptum esset *neque in homine inesse animum, nec in bestia*, offenderet vox *animus* ad bestiam quoque relata; qualis offensio aut nulla est aut minor certe, si præcedunt verba *vel animam*. Ceterum has duas voces Davisius in tertia editione a. MDCCLXXX. (non in prima a. MDCCLX. quam utramque possideo: de reliquis Davisianis referre non possum) dicit Lambinum a quibusdam Codd. abesse testari.

Ibid. §. 22. *quatuor. nota illa genera*] Nota cum Davisio ex edd. vet. et mss. restituit Wolfius sequente Schützio. Ernestius quidem vocem *nota* glossema esse dicit τοῦ *illa*. At sunt exempla crebra et protrita vocis utriusque sic conjunctæ. Gravius ac significantius loquitur Cicero, quam si *nota* omisisset.

Cap. XI. §. 22. *hæ sunt fere de animo sententiæ.*] Omnium post fere deest in bonis quibusdam Davisii codd., qui delevit. Non bene, Ernestius inquit. Jam ex Hermiæ Irrisione Gentilium patet quidem, longe non omnes Veterum de animo sen-

tentias a Cicerone esse allatas. Sed scribere poterat fere Omnium. Quum vero Omnium in bonis quibusdam codd. non reperiatur, lex autem sit in crisi tenenda, ubi facilis sit modus quo aliquid adjici potuerit, facilem esse suspicionem, si id a bonis codd. absit: cur Wolfius rejecerit *omnium* patet. Fere autem pertinet ad pronomen *hæ*, quod librarium fugiebat fortasse. Eodem modo Græci adjiciunt *ως*, nos autem: *so, so ungefähr*.

Cap. XII. §. 27. *idque quum multis aliis rebus, tum e pontificio jure et cærimoniis sepulcrorum intelligi licet, quas maximis ingeniis præditi nec tanta cura coluissent, nec violatas tam inexplabili religione sanxissent, nisi hæreret in eorum mentibus, mortem etc.*] *Hæreret* in pluribus mss. repertum lectioni vulgatæ *Hæsisset* prætulerunt Davisius, Wolfius, Schützius. Cur Wolfius prætulerit, scio per ipsum. Nempe verbum hærendi, ut pauca alia verba, hoc proprii habet, quod sæpe Imperfectum et Plusquamperfectum commutari possint; tum etiam Perfectum et Præsens. Hoc ex vocabuli significatione oritur. *Hæserunt pennæ in veste tua; hærent etc.* (*Es haben sich Federn angehängt etc. Es hangen Federn an etc.*) *Hæserunt* autem Germanice etiam verti potest: *es hängen*. *Hæsisset* est: *es hätte sich angehängt, festgesetzt*; *hæreret* est: jam in eo loco erat, ubi *hæsisset* præteritum erat. Nam postquam aliquid *hæsit* (*sich angehängt hat*), *hæret* (*hangt es*); postquam *hæserat* (*sich angehängt hatte*) *hærebat* (*hing es*). Jam aliis etiam locis Cicero in verbo hærendi Perfecto Tempori Præsens, Plusquamperfecto Imperfectum præfert. Hæc una ratio est defendendæ lectionis a Wolfio receptæ. Alteram esse dicebat quod constructioni et consecutioni Temporum *hæreret* h. l. magis conveniret quam *hæsisset*, quia Imperfecto significetur actio per longum tempus durans.

Ibid. mortem non interitum esse omnia tollentem et delentem, sed quandam quasi migrationem, commutationemque vitæ, quæ in claris viris et feminis dux in cælum soleret esse; quum ceteri humi retinerentur, ut permanerent tamen.] Quod vulgo edebatur: 'in ceteris humi retineretur, et permaneret tamen,' Cicero scribere non potuit. Quod Ernestius conjecit, scribere poluit: 'cum ceteri h. retinerentur et permanerent tamen.' Hoc Wolfius amplexus est excepto *et*, pro quo posuit *ut*, hoc sensu: ita tamen, ut permanerent. ('Ut permanerent tamen' legendum arbitrabatur etiam Davisius in prima editione, quanquam ibi non sic edidit; testatus insuper, sic habere editionem Colon. Fabricii.) Non satis accurate igitur Schützius Ernestii correctionem simpliciter dixit Wolfio receptam.

Ibid. §. 28 et apud Græcos, indeque perlapsus ad nos, et

usque ad Oceanum, *Hercules*, tantus et tam præsens habetur deus. hinc *Liber* [deus] *Semela* natus, eademque famæ celebritate *Tyndaridæ fratres*.] Quod vulgo additur, sed a quibusdam codd. abest, *deus*, *Wolfius* uncis inclusit, *Davisius* et *Schützius* deleverunt. Scil. *tanti et tam præsentes habentur dii*, hæc omnia intelligenda, non *deus*. Formam *Semela* *Wolfius* cum *Davisio* posuit pro *Semele*, meliorum h. l. codicum in re ambigua auctoritatem secutus.

Cap. XIV. §. 31. *quod omnibus curæ sunt, et Maximæ quidem, quæ post mortem futura sint.*] *Davisius*, *Wolfius*, *Schützius* pro vulg. *maxime* ediderunt *maximæ*. Recte, quum *Cicero* non dicat: *hoc mihi magis* (vel *h. m. minus*) *curæ est*, sed potius *hoc mihi majoris & minoris* curæ.

Ibid. ut ait ille in Synephebis] In aliis codd. legitur, ut in *Ernestii* editione: *ut ait Statius* etc.; in aliis *ut ait Ennius*. Fabula autem *Synepheborum* *Cæcili* *Statii* fuit, non *Ennii*. Comœdia fuit ex Græco Comico Latine reddita. *Ennii* vero paucissimæ fuerunt, si quæ fuerunt, Comœdiæ: *Statius* in hoc genere regnabat. Dubitatio autem de lectione oritur. Pars *Statii*, pars *Ennii* nomen præferunt. Ubi major aliqua versatur varietas, de utriusque lectionis veritate dubitare licebit. Scilicet quod sæpissime alias fit apud *Ciceronem*, sicubi versus aliquis laudatur, ut pronomen *ille* adhibeatur de persona aliqua, id etiam h. l. statuendum videtur. Atque si ita scripsit *Cicero*, tale pronomen quasi allicit et ducit post se facillime glossema aliquod. Sequuntur hæc: *quid spectans, nisi etiam postera sæcula ad se pertinere?* Dicit *ad se*. An igitur Poëta illud spectavit? Nullo modo hoc ferri potest. Igitur vel hac de causa conjectura quamvis audax adamari debet. De *Nat. Deor.* I. 6. simillimum quid factum est, ad quem locum conf. *Wolfium* ipsum in *Analectis litterariis* II. p. 303. At exspectabas: *Sero arbores* etc. Ille qui in *Synephebis* illud dixit, haud dubie ita dixerat. Sed hic versus statim pæne in proverbium abiebat. Hinc *Serit* etc.

Ibid. §. 31. quid Adoptiones filiorum] *Adoptiones* in bonis codd. legitur pro vulg. *Adoptiones*. Atque a verbo adoptandi facile procedit *adoptatio*. Alia exempla afferri possunt, ubi sola usurpatur formula huic similis; ut *afflictatio* a verbo *afflictare* apud *Ciceronem* legitur, non *afflictio*. Etiam apud *Sallustium*, qui plerumque servat antiquiorem formulam, est illud *adoptatio* *Jugurtha* c. XI. §. 6, ubi conf. *Cortii* annotationem p. 455. Jure igitur recepit *Wolfius*, præeunte *Davio*, sequente *Schützio*.

Ibid. §. 32. num dubitas, quin specimen naturæ capi deceat

ex optima quaque natura?] Male Ernestius cum Lambino et Davisio codicum lectionem deceat mutavit in debeat. Rectius dixeris: *specimen artis ex optimo quoque artifice decet capi, quam: specimen—debet.* *Debet* idem est quod consentaneum est, quod convenit; *debendi* vocabulum domicilium habet in officio. Jure igitur antiquam lectionem deceat revocavit Wolfius, probante Censore in Ephem. litt. Jenens. a. 1792 No. 113, et Goerenzio ad Cic. de Fin. IV. c. XI. §. 28. Recepit etiam Schützius. *Deceat* defendit jam Wopkens. Lectt. Tull. p. 51, allatis locis similibus, sed non exposito discrimine quod est inter verba *deceat* et *debet*.

Cap. XV. §. 34. In illo Ennii elogio pro vulg. *pinxit* jam Bentleius optime tuietur, quam Wolfius recepit, lectionem *panxit*. Adde quod pingendi vocabulum non solum ad poëma pertinet, sed ad quancunque narrationem, etiam prosa expositam, ubi coloribus aliquis ornat narrata. *Pangere* vocabulum apud antiquiores frequentatum, Lucretianum imprimis.

Ibid. *Quid enim Phidias sui similem speciem inclusit in clipeo Minervæ, quum inscribere non liceret?*] Ernestii conjectura, excidisse nomen ante *non*, speciem habet, non veritatem. Dicimus *inscribere aliquid alicui rei*, nec minus bene *inscribere aliquid aliqua re*. Hoc igitur loco verbis *quum inscribere non liceret* subintelligendum videtur: clipeum nomine suo. Fieri etiam potest, simpliciter Ciceronem dixisse *inscribere*, ut *ἐπιγράφειν* simpliciter nonnunquam est *ἐπιγραφήν ποιεῖν*. Legere me memini conjecturam Censoris editionis Davisianæ per Rathium repetitæ in Ephemeridibus Litterar. Halensibus (A. L. Z. a. 1806. No. 79) quem Wolfium non esse facile intelligas ex censura. Ille igitur sic statuit esse legendum: *quum inscribere nomen liceret*. Scil. Phidiæ non satis erat, nomen addere artificio: etiam effigiem suam tradere voluit posteritati, ut hodie librorum auctores præter nomen nonnunquam imaginem suam æri insculptam libris præponunt. Hæc etiam conjectura speciem habet, non veritatem. Nam aliud est *licere*, aliud *non satis esse*; neque certo constat, quod sumit Vir doctus ad conjecturam stabiliendam, imo ne veri quidem simile est, nomen Phidiæ artificio additum fuisse. Saltem apud Plutarchum Pericle c. XXXI. ed. Hutten. T. I. p. 420, qui locus classicus est de illo clipeo, (conf. etiam Auctorem libri *de Mundo* cap. VII. ed. Kapp. p. 271) nihil est de nomine inscripto. Ceterum de quonam Minervæ signo Phidiaco sermo sit, tirones discant ex Boettigeri nostri libello eruditissime scripto: *Andeutungen zu XXIV Vorlesungen über die Archäologie*, p. 84—90.

Cap. XV. §. 38. *sed quod litteris exstet proditum.*] Ernestii

lectio *proditum* ne ullum quidem codicem habet auctorem, et sicubi est vocabulum, est *probo*. Sed ex hoc non sine sagacitate exsculpsit Reiskius, quem Ernestius ne nominavit quidem, *proditum*, quod recipiendum censuerunt cum Ernestio Wolfius et Schützius.

CAROLUS MORGENSTERN.

Dorpati.

ON THE VARIOUS READINGS OF THE HEBREW BIBLE.

LETTER I.

THE collation of Hebrew MSS. by Dr. Kennicott forms an important epoch in the history of Biblical criticism. Before the period when this collation took place, an opinion generally prevailed, that the text of the Hebrew Bible had been preserved free from error and defect; and that no various readings of any consequence were to be found, either in the editions, or in the MSS., of the Hebrew Bible. About the middle of the 17th century Cappellus and Morinus maintained a different hypothesis. "Hic sane," says Morinus, speaking of the opinion mentioned above, respecting the immaculate state of the Hebrew text, "Hic sane insolentissima confidentia cum ignorantia maxima conjungitur. Hebraica Biblia sunt sincerissima. Quamobrem vero? Non alia ratione ducuntur, quam quod excusa sibi invicem consentire animadvertant. Idem de MSS. omnium ætatum, quorum ne specimina quidem unquam viderunt, affirmandum esse temere pronunciant. Nec cogitant omnes fere libros editos ex uno et eodem fonte dimanasse; ideo consensum illum non magis admirandum esse, quam editionum vulgatæ versionis auctoritate Clementis VIII. recensitarum unitissimam concordiam." The account of Cappellus's laborious and valuable work I shall give, in the words of Dr. Kennicott. "The man who first undertook to bring the printed text of the Old Testament to the test of sound criticism, was the learned and now justly celebrated Ludovicus Cappellus, in his *Critica Sacra*,

¹ Kennicott's 1st Dissert. on the state of the printed Hebrew text, p. 295.

the work of six-and-thirty years; a work, which, notwithstanding the violence with which the publication of it was (for the space of ten years) opposed by some, notwithstanding the virulence with which it was condemned after publication by many others, (and is condemned to this very day by a few,) and notwithstanding some undoubted mistakes, in particular places, will be a lasting monument of the fame of its author.”¹ “Cappellus undertakes to prove—that various readings may, and ought to be, collected on the books of the Hebrew Testament, on account of the many mistakes in the modern copies, which mistakes have been occasioned by the ignorance and carelessness of transcribers—that one principal means of discovering these various readings is, a careful examination of the ancient versions, and a judicious comparison of them with the present Hebrew text—and that, from the many places in which the printed Hebrew text differs widely from the sense of those ancient versions, and places where the translators could have no reason for varying designedly, we may properly infer that their *written* copies were in these places somewhat different from our *printed* copies; consequently that we may safely refer to these versions wherever the present Hebrew text is unintelligible, absurd or contradictory.”² The new doctrines advanced by Cappellus and Morinus met with great opposition: nor did the subject of dispute between them and their opponents admit of a satisfactory decision till the extensive collation of MSS. and editions of the Hebrew Scriptures undertaken and executed by Dr. Kennicott. This learned and laborious critic states, in the *Dissertatio generalis* at the end of his edition of the Hebrew Bible, that he at one time thought that the printed editions of the Hebrew Bible differed very little, and in matters of trifling import, from the autographs of Moses and the prophets. He was led by degrees to form a different opinion, in consequence of a request from Bp. Lowth that he would compare the Hebrew text of 2 Sam. xxiii. 8. with that of the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xi. 11.³ A careful examination of these and other parallel passages convinced him that the Hebrew text had materially suffered from the errors of transcribers, and in a dissertation on 1 Chron. xi. compared with 2 Sam. v. and xxiii. he endeavoured to prove the truth of this position, and proposed an extensive collation of Hebrew MSS. with a view to

¹ Kennicott's 1st Dissert. p. 279.

² Kennicott's 1st Dissert. p. 280.

³ See Kennicott's Dissert. Gener. p. 57.

the restoration of the Hebrew text, as far as so desirable an object could be attained, to its original purity. The sentiments of Dr. Kennicott, though supported with much ability and cogency of reasoning, met with considerable opposition; but happily his plan obtained the powerful support of a prelate, not less eminent for a profound knowledge of the Hebrew language, and skill and acuteness in Biblical criticism, than for a zealous and conscientious discharge of his important public functions; "vir," as Bishop Lowth elegantly describes him, "summæ eruditionis, summo loco." The collation of Hebrew MSS. was begun in the year 1761, under the auspices of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, followed soon afterwards by the patronage of the King of England, and of most of the crowned heads in Europe, and the second and last volume was published in 1780. The MSS. Hebrew and Samaritan, collated by Kennicott and his coadjutor Bruns, for this splendid and valuable work, amounted to no less than 600, besides 30 editions: and the facts resulting from this collation have proved to demonstration, that the opinion of Cappellus, Morinus, and Kennicott, as to the state of the printed Hebrew text, is substantially true—that there is no immaculate copy of the Hebrew text at present in existence, and that the same means must be used for correcting the text of the Old Testament, as have already been used with so much success in correcting the New Testament. It is not necessary, nor indeed would it accord with my own sentiments, to vindicate all the conjectural emendations of the Hebrew text proposed by Dr. Kennicott. Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus: and we ought rather to be surprised that so many of his critical conjectures have received a strong support from MSS. afterwards collated, than that he has sometimes proposed amendments without sufficient grounds. I will conclude this letter by stating some facts which I conceive to have been fully proved by Kennicott's collation.

Dr. Kennicott's collation has proved—

1st. That the MSS. of the Hebrew text differ, in a great number of passages, from the printed text. "Codex hic Mstus.," says Kennicott, speaking of the Bodleian MS. No. 1, "continet lectiones circiter 14,000 a textu Hoohtiano diversas."¹

2nd. That the printed copies of the Hebrew Bible differ materially from each other. "Monendum est," says Kenni-

¹ Diss. Gen. p. 21.

cott, speaking of the editions of the Hebrew Bible published in the 15th century; “monendum est harum editionum primam,¹ etsi tantum psalmos complectatur, habere supra 600 diversitates integris verbis vel literis. Editionem vero ultimam, quæ est Bibliorum, *continere plures quam 12,000.*”² “Primi editores prophetarum priorum affirmant—penes nos fuerunt exemplaria multa probata et bona—*non libera tamen ab erroribus et mendis*; nam profecto inventio libri absque mendo vel errore miraculum foret.”

3rd. That many readings of the collated MSS. are decidedly preferable to Vanderhooght’s text; and serve to correct that text in many places where it is obviously corrupt or defective. Some proofs of this will be found in my remarks on Mr. Bellamy’s New Translation, inserted in the *Class. Journ.* xxxv. p. 151.

4th. That the Septuagint and other ancient versions are confirmed by the authority of MSS. in many passages, where the reading of those versions is preferable to that of Vanderhooght’s text. For proof of this, I refer the reader either to Kennicott’s *Dissertatio Generalis*, or to the readings of the ancient versions in Boothroyd’s *Biblia Hebraica*—a valuable work, though I shall have occasion to prove in a subsequent letter that it *abounds* with typographical errors.

KIMCHI.

Falmouth, May, 1822.

¹ Psalmi 1477.

² Diss. Gen. p. 25.

CRITICAL REMARKS

ON DR. OSANN'S EDITION OF PHILEMON.

No. II.—[Continued from No. L. p. 343.]

“DENIQUE addendum notas in Philemonis Lex. auctore Britanno Anonymo, editas in Mus. Crit. Cant. 1. et 2., ad quarum calcem sigla *R. W.* adposita est, quum frugi esse viderentur, omniaque Philemonem spectantia simul hac in Edit. contineri vellem, integras in notis nominato ubique auctore repetendas curavi, perpaucis exceptis, quæ locum scriptoris alicujus sisterent et sine dispendio sensus concisius afferri posset.” P. xli. The signature *R. W.* denotes *Robert Walpole*, the learned traveller.

“Οἶον *ὕπηλιφης, *ἀνυπηλιφής: e Cod. editum οἶον νηλιφής, ἀνηλιφής, quæ mutavi secundum Lexici SGM. inediti locum et Etym. M. 61. Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ ἰ γράφεται, οἶον *ὕπηλιφης, *ἀνυπηλιφής, σημαίνει δὲ τὴν ναῦν τὴν μὴ ἀλειφθεῖσαν πίσσῃ: quo minus autem hic de mendo cogitetur, facit alius Etym. locus p. 22. Ἀζωστος ναῦς ἐστὶν ἡ *ἀνυπηλιφής, ubi perperam edebatur* ἀνυπηλιφος, quo vitio etiam Phrynich. in Bekk. Anecd. 21. *Ἀνυπηλιφος ναῦς· ἡ μὴ ὑπαληλιμμένη κ. τ. λ. laborabat, licet Bekkeri errorem Barkerus Epist. Cr. ad Boissonad. 217. propagarit. Igitur etiam Phav. [post Eust. ap. H. Steph. Thes. p. 1799. d. Ed. Lond.] fallitur, quum l. c. scribit, οἶον ἀνηλιφής ναῦς, ἡ μὴ ἀλειφθεῖσα πίσσῃ, facile corrigendus.” P. 17. See the *New Gr. Thes.* l. c.

“De nominum in *αλεος* desinentium accentu egregie disputavit E. G. [H.] Barker. in Aristarcho Anti-Blomf. sive *A Reply to the Notice of the New Gr. Thes.*, Londini edito 1820. P. 1. p. 7. et xviii. Vide et ipsam *Lond. H. Steph. Thes. Edit.* p. 1493. a. v. Αἰθαλέος, ubi tamen ab Editoribus in eo erratum est, quod vocem νηφαλέος et Philemonis et Arcadii de Acc. 38. auctoritate firmatam nihili esse contenderunt. Utramque vocis formam et Schneider. et Riemer. optime agnoscunt, modo non νηφάλεις evulgassent.” P. 41. “Sententiam de delenda v. νηφαλέος latam quum ipse Barkerus in Add. ad Aristarchum suum p. 112. retractavit, non debebat vir eruditissimus erroris a me redargui. Rei conficiendæ tunc satis, habeo Herodiani περὶ Μονήρους Λέξεως Fr. attulisse, paucis ante mensibus e Cod. Taurinensi erutum a Peyron Notit. Codd. Taur. 33., ubi de

accentu hujus generis adjectivorum fuse disputatum est." P. xxxvii.

"*Ῥύμβος*, Phav. Ampliorē Etym. M. 640. ubi v. quæ E. G. [H.] Barker. ea, qua solet, eruditione conguessit: quibus addas Schol. e Cod. vetustissimo sæculi fere X., olim Mutinensi, jam Regio Paris. 451., Clementis Alex. nonnulla continente partim editum a Bast. ad Greg. C. 141. [241.] quod integrum hic describo, repertum fol. 8. verso ad Coh. ad Gr. p. 15.: *Κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος* κῶνοι, οἱ στρόβιλοι καὶ οἱ θύρσοι, ὡς Διογενιανός. *Ῥόμβος*, δῖνος, κῶνος, ξυλήριον, (Bast. *ξυλάριον* eidentem Cod. scriptura fefellit,) οὗ ἐξήπται τὸ σπαρτίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ἐδονεῖτο, ἵνα ροιζῇ τὸ δέ. . . καὶ ῥύμβος ἐκαλεῖτο οὕτως Διογενιανός. Ὅτι δὲ [insert, ὁ] ῥόμβος καὶ ῥύμβος λέγεται, Ἀπολλωνίος φησιν ὁ Ῥόδιος, Ῥύμβω καὶ τυμπάνω Ῥεῖν φρύγες ἰλάσκονται." P. 112. Bast. l. c. has thus edited the Gloss: *Κῶνοι*. οἱ στρόβιλοι καὶ οἱ θύρσοι, ὡς Διογενιανός, ῥόμβος, δῖνος: Et: *Κῶνος*. *ξυλάριον*, οὗ ἐξήπται τὸ σπαρτίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ἐδονεῖτο, ἵνα ροιζῇ. Τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ῥύμβος ἐκαλεῖτο. Οὕτω Διογενιανός. 1. Bast has rightly read, in the Ms., which he calls Cod. Moden., or rightly supplied from conjecture, αὐτὸ after τὸ δέ. 2. But he has evidently mistaken the Gloss, reading it as if it were two separate Glosses on the word κῶνος, whereas the head of the article, which head he has omitted, *Κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος*, and the concluding words, *Τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ῥόμβος ἐκαλεῖτο*, might have satisfied him that the first relates to κῶνος, and the second to ῥόμβος. In the Notes on *Etym. M.* 1108. Ed. Sturz. I have produced the Scholion, and subjoined the following remarks:—"Sic Schol. hortulos suos irrigavit ex eodem flumine, quod libavit Hesych. *Ῥόμβος*. ψόφος, στρόφος, ἥχος, δῖνος, κῶνος, ξυλήριον, οὗ ἐξήπται σχοινίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς δινεῖται." The Gloss of Hes. quite confirms the punctuation and arrangement of Osann. 3. Hes. has *ξυλήριον*, which Bast had tacitly corrected into *ξυλάριον*, guided perhaps by the unnecessary doubt, which H. Steph. Thes. 2, 1142. c. had expressed, about the genuineness of the form *ξυλήριον*: see Osann. p. 82. who has neglected to notice Lobeck. ad Phrynich. Ed. 78.:—"Ξυλήριον autem, cui Albert. patrocinator ad Hes. v. *Ῥόμβος*, atque tota illa terminatio deminutivorum in *ῆριον*, de qua docte et copiose egit Spohn. meus Comm. de Extr. Odyss. Parte 133., multas habet suspiciones. Etym. autem hoc modo scripsisse videtur: *Ξυλάριον*—δοκιμώτερον δὲ τὸ *ξυλύφιον* καὶ *ξυλάριον*." But, when Lobeck has seen Philemon l. c. and read the note of Osann, he will change his opinion.

"*Σμήρος* καλεῖται καὶ ἐσμὸς, μετὰ δασέος πνεύματος, ὡς δηλοῖ παρὰ Ἀριστοτέλει ὁ ἄφεσμάς. H. A. 9, 27. (40.) ubi Schneidero pro

ἀφροσύνη e Cod. Med. ἀφροσύνη ἐδέντι jure obloquutus nuper est E. G. [H.] Barker. in Wolfii Anal. Liter. Fasc. 3, 67. [Classical Journal, T. 18. p. 344.] cui vulg. scripturam defendenti jam Philemonis auctoritas accessit." P. 121. In the passage referred to I have not decidedly rejected the reading adopted by Schneider, nor have I decidedly adopted the vulgar reading ἀφροσύνη. My words are these:—"Quum tamen Eust. suo in exemplari ἀφροσύνη repperit, amplius de hac lectione cogitandum videtur. Certe ἀφροσύνη pro simpl. ἐδέντι tam mira est loquutio, ut vix eam sine corruptelæ suspitione transmittere possumus." I am, however, now happy to say that, whatever doubt I did feel, has been entirely satisfied by M. Hermann's just defence of ἀφροσύνη, which is subjoined to Mr. B.'s article, p. 73-4. Osann is also mistaken in supposing that Mr. B. has not quoted the passage of Philemon, which he will find p. 66. 215. ἐν ἀγνῶ δ' ἐδέντι ὡς πελειάδων. V. δέσμος, Inc. δ' ἐδέντι. Extat ἐδέντι γυναικῶν in Aristoph. A. 353. et ἐδέντι—μυρμήκων in Babrii Fab. 4. De Fur. 363. Fuit, opinor, vox e re aviaria derivata, et proprie dicta de perdicibus inter congregandum sedentibus, Anglice *Covey*. Malim igitur ἐδέντι ab ἔζομαι." Burges. ad Æsch. Suppl. p. 99. On the question, ἐδέντι an ἐδέντι, the reader can see what I have said in p. 66-7. where too p. 64. other examples of the word being applied to denote a number may be found. I cannot assent to the ingenious remark of my friend Burges, that the word is "e re aviaria derivata, et proprie dicta de perdicibus inter congregandum sedentibus, Anglice *Covey*," because on that supposition it could never have been applied to denote a quantity of liquid, such as γάλακτος ἐδέντι Eur. Bacch. 710. Philostr. V. S. 1, 19. p. 511.; ἐδέντι μελίσσης, Mel, Epinicus ap. Athen. 432. I therefore still think that the primary meaning of the word is a vessel adapted for receiving bees, a *Hive*, a *Skep*:—1. because from this as the primary meaning you may easily trace every sense attributed to the word; 2. because I have shown that σμῆνος, a synonym of ἐδέντι, is used in precisely the same manner to denote a hive of bees, then a vessel of honey, and metaphorically a multitude of persons, animals, things etc. Dr. Blomf. Gloss. ad Pr. 373. has made a similar mistake:—"Ἰπῶ, Premo, Affligo,—videtur manasse ab ἵψ, Animalculum, quod cornua peredit." I agree with the learned Dr. in considering the notion of pressure to be the primary idea of ἵπῶ, but I must reject his derivation from ἵψ, until he has proved how well that idea accords with the habits of the animalcule: see Mr. Barker's *Diss. on the verb ἵπῶ*, in Classical Journal, T. 9. p. 114.

“Χάλιξ. Magnopere conferenda sunt, quæ E. G. [H.] Barker. Annot. ad Etym. M. 1128. diligenter conguessit. Pro edito ὑποστέλλειν, quod mihi quidem sensu carere omnino videbatur, auctore Barker. l. c. 1130. ὑποστένειν scripsi, quod simillimo contextu Eust. 1936. habet. De v. ὑποστένειν nihil statim succurrit. Contra apposite derivativum ὑποστενάζω, Eumath. 5. p. 212. Ἡ δ' ὑπεστέναξε λεπτὸν ἀφροδίσιον, καὶ τὸ λεπτὸν ἐρωτικὸν ἀποστέναγμα ὅλην ἡδονὴν ἐς αὐτὴν μοι μέσσην ἐστάλαξε τὴν ψυχὴν. Apertum est e Cod. Par. Reg. 2895., quem inter Parisienses optimum judico, * ὑποστέναγμα esse suscipiendum. Concidit igitur v. ἀποστέναγμα, ex h. l. a Schmidtio *Tausend Griechische Wörter* p. 14. enotata. Atque ὑπεστέναξε recte habere, plura ejusdem Auctoris loca abunde docent, e quibus cito 4. p. 116. Ἵποστενάζω de *Quavis leniori lamentatione* præcipue usurpatur: ita Soph. Aj. 315.” P. 194. Even if the Cod. alluded to had not contained the reading ὑποστέναγμα, the context and common sense would have proved the necessity of introducing it. For the verbal noun was meant to re-echo the meaning of the verb itself, and therefore if the one was ἀπεστέναξε, the other must have been ἀποστέναγμα, or, if the one was ὑποστέναξε, the other would unavoidably have been ὑποστέναγμα.

““ Discimus ex Schol. Ven. II. B. 262. Aristarchum αἰδῶ, ἧῶ circumflexe scripsisse, Dionysium vero Sidonium oxytone. Pamphilus omnes id genus accusativos circumflectebat, Dionysius Thra. Aristarchum culpat, qui αἰδῶ et ἧῶ circumflexe scripserit, alia vero oxytone, Πυθῶ, Αἰητῶ. Vide etiam ad II. I. 240.’ R. W. in Mus. Crit. Cant. 1, 126.” P. 7. See *Amæn. Crit. et Philol.*, in *Classical Journal* 31, 112-3.

“Θηῆσις, θνήσεως, θνησεῖδιον, quæ omnia vide ne sint Grammaticorum inventa, qui quum pluralem τὰ θνησεῖδια passim ap. bonos scriptores reperirent, repetendum eum a sing. dimin. θνησεῖδιον putaverunt. Gerit sane quidem vox τὰ θνησεῖδια substantivæ sæpe vicem: sing. autem nusquam offenderis. Pluralis exempla habes collecta a Beck. ad Aristoph. O. 537., ubi Scholiastæ κενέβρια τὰ θνησεῖδια restituas velim pro θνησιμαῖα, auctore Schol. Cod. Victor. in Thierschii Act. Phil. Mon. 1, 3. p. 393. collato Piersono ad Herodian. 466.: quanquam de ipsa v. θνησιμαῖος dubitandum minime esse providit Lobeckii diligentia in Parerg. ad Phrynich. 558. Beckii exemplis adde Philostr. V. A. 1, 1. Ἑσθῆτα, (quo jure et Schneider. Lex. v. Θνησεῖδιος, et Frenzelii *Beiträge zu Schneiders Griechisch-Deutschem Wörterbuche* Isenaci 1810. edito p. 11., ἐσθήματα citent, scire velim, quum vulgatam duo quoque Codd. Paris. tueantur,) τε ἐκ θνησειδίων, ibique Oléar., et 8, 7, 4. Denique Porphy. de Abst.

4, 16. p. 353. Παραγγέλλεται γὰρ καὶ Ἐλευσῖνι ἀπέχεσθαι κατοικιδίων ὀρνίθων, καὶ ἰχθύων, καὶ κυάμων, ροῖᾶς τε καὶ μήλων, καὶ ἐπίσης μεμíanται οὐ στελέθους ἄψασθαι, ὡς τὸ θνησειδίων: quo loco quum de cibis tantummodo sermo sit, quibus mystæ Cereris vesci interdicerentur, sponte apparet Boissonadi conjecturam, Μεμíanται τὸ στελέθου ἄψασθαι ὡς τὸ θνησειδίων, ad Herodiani Epimer. 120. prolatam, plane concidere, etsi pro οὐ corrigendum esse τὸ recte sensisse videtur: ἄπτεσθαι autem proprie de cibis dici docet locus Clem. Alex. huc maxime faciens, Pædag. 2. p. 149. Sylb., ubi de Moyse: Ὡν δὲ ἐφῆκεν ἄπτεσθαι, πάλιν κεκάλυκε τούτων τὰ θνησιμαῖα, τὰ τε εἰδωλόβυτα, τὰ τε ἀποπεπνιγμένα. Adde Athen. 308." P. 68. This note will call forth many observations. 1. In the passage from Porphyry Osann has inadvertently omitted καὶ before κατοικιδίων. 2. In the passage from Clem. Alex. he has adopted the vulgar reading θνησιμαῖα, a word *formed* against analogy, which *deforms* even Potter's Edn., and which must be corrected into θνησιμαῖα. 3. The reading ἐσθήματα in the passage from Philostr. has been incautiously adopted from Schneider's Lex. by the Editors of the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 521. b.; and it also appears in the work of H. Stephens 1, 1564. in v. Θῆσις, who quotes it from Budæus. 4. The Editors do not think, that to vindicate the observation of Philemon, there is any occasion to produce an instance of θνησειδίων used in the singular; for its existence may be inferred from the plural τὰ θνησειδία, which Osann supposes to be alone in use. However, the singular does occur in *Ælian* H. A. 6, 2. Ἀλλὰ μὴ δοκεῖν ἐσθλὲν κενέβριόν τε καὶ θνησειδίων. Suid.: Θνησιμαῖον τὸ νενεκρωμένον, καὶ Θνησειδίων τὸ νεκρόν: cf. Zonar. et Tittmanni Cyrill.: Θνησειδίων τὸ θνησιμαῖον. Θνησιμαῖον τὸ νενεκρωμένον. 5. In the passage of Porphyry the clause, καὶ ἐπίσης μεμíanται κ. τ. λ., is not necessarily to be understood *de cibis*. For, if he had so intended, there would have been no occasion to introduce the words ἐπίσης μεμíanται at all, as the genitive τοῦ—ἄψασθαι without them, would have been quite sufficient. But those words clearly prove a change of topic, and therefore Boissonade's conjecture does not plainly fall to the ground. His words are these:—"Multum se torserunt VV. DD. circa h. l. et nuper ad novam et luculentam Sancto-Crucii, *Mysteriorum* Edit. 1, 282. 461. Proponam et conjecturam meam, Καὶ ἐπίσης μεμíanται τὸ στελέθου ἄψασθαι, ὡς τὸ θνησειδίων, et cadaverum contrectatio æque est impura ac stercoris. De v. σπέλεος cf. Elmsl. ad Acharn. 170." 6. The alteration of οὐ into τὸ belongs not to Boissonade, but to Valent. ap. De Rhoer. 7. Osann has overlooked the Add. to Boissonade's work, p. 295.:—"De locq Porphyrii

vide omnino *Thes. H. Stephani Lond. Ed.* p. 519." where the following lection, partly suggested by Valent., Gale, Reisk, and Abresch, and partly original, is adopted, *Καὶ ἐπίσης μεμíanται τῷ λεχούς ἀψασθαι, ὡς τῷ θνητεύειν.* The observations of the Editors are too copious to be transcribed on the present occasion; but I believe that the careful reader of them will be perfectly satisfied with the propriety of the proposed, and those very slight, alterations. 8. Osann begins his note with the words:—"Θνήσις, θνήσεως, θνησείδιον, quæ omnia vide ne sint Grammaticorum inventa, qui quum plur. τὰ θνησεΐδια passim ap. bonos scriptt. reperirent, repetendum eum a sing. demin. θνησείδιον putaverunt." But, as the reasoning of Philemon holds in regard to the other words, which he mentions: (*Τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ἰς βηλυκῶν διὰ τοῦ εἰς κλινομένων διὰ τοῦ εἰδίου γινόμενα, διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται, ὅλον θνήσις, θνήσεως, θνησείδιον· *άλυσείδιον· ταξείδιον· *δαμαλαεΐδιον· κτησείδιον· καὶ ἕτερα:*) it must hold in regard to this, whether there be any example of θνήσις, or not. "Θνήσις, Morf, φθορά, Suid. i. e. Corruptio. Sed nullum hujus usus exemplum affert. Existimo autem tanquam a fut. θνήσω esse formatum, sicut τεθήσειν ex Dione protuli. Eandem certe, quam θνήσις, formationem, (quæcunque sit,) sequitur Nomen Θνησιμαῖος, item Θνησείδιον." H. Steph. *Thes.* l. c.

On the following words of Philemon p. 70.:—*Λαγίδης. πατρωνυμικόν, ἐκ τοῦ λαγοῦ, ὡς ὁ τοῦ πελαργοῦ γόνος, *πελαργίδης· τοῦ λύκου, *λυκίδης· *ἀλεκτορίδης· *χηνίδης· *περδικίδης:* Osann says:—"Vulgo *Λαγωῦ*, quod fieri posse nullo modo persuadeor, quum *Λαγίδης* formari hinc minime possit: neque moror ea, quæ ap. Suid. leguntur, *Λαγίδης· ὁ τοῦ λαγωῦ.*" But Tittmann ad Zonar. had previously so corrected the Gloss of Suidas. Osann refers to Valck. and Huschk. as the only or chief authorities respecting the termination of nouns in *δεύς*, and if he looks into the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 1286. b—90. c., he will find the entire observations of those critics with much original matter: see also Mr. Barker's *Epist. Cr. ad Gaisford.*, in *Classical Journal* 25, 175—6. It is to be noted that *Λαγίδης* is from *Λάγος*, and *λαγιδεύς* from *λαγός*. Osann tacitly cites from *Etym.* M. 554. *Τὰ γὰρ εἰς ὅς ὀνόματα, εἰ μὲν καθαρὰ, διὰ τοῦ ἀδης ποιοῦσι τὸ πατρωνυμικόν· — εἰ δὲ μὴ καθαρὰ, διὰ τοῦ ἰδης, Κρόνος, [Κρονίδης, accidentally omitted by Osann,] Λαγός, Λαγίδης, and so Schæfer has edited the passage; but we must read Λάγος, as in *Etym.* M. 165. *Βῆλος, *Βηλίδης· Λάγος, Λαγίδης. See the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 1290. b.*

Theford, July, 1822.

E. H. BARKER.

REMARKS

*On Criticisms of the Pentateuch, by Eichhorn,
Bertholdt, &c.*

• No. I.—EICHHORN.

WHATEVER may have been the religious doctrine of the Israelites before the days of Moses, it must be confessed that he stamped a certain originality and stability on it, which the nomadic lives of their ancestors prevented them from acquiring. Yet, we must at the same time suppose, that he selected his history from the ancestral traditions and poetical remains of the patriarchs, as well as a vast multitude of his institutions from some in use among them, and in a certain degree common to the Oriental world.

But, although sound criticism obliges us to admit this fact ;—when we observe the types, by which he prefigured the advent of the Messiah, continuing unimpaired to the Babylonian captivity, and resuming their primitive force and intent, when the people became once more settled in Jerusalem ; and when we remark those wise precautions, which he adopted to preserve the higher knowledge of his day among the Priests, we must likewise assent to those claims of inspiration, which he asserted. Having had opportunities of examining the esoteric dogmata of the Egyptians, and being acquainted with the bigoted Polytheism of the common mass, he was able to trace the gradual rise of the human intellect from the personifications of atmospheric phenomena, and the deification of inert matter, up to the exalted doctrine of One Incorporeal and Supreme Being. The Babylonian and Egyptian systems of Theology were placed within his inquiry ; hence he was qualified to separate the true from the false, to retain such rites and customs, as were borrowed in these from the Patriarchal Church, to enact such salutary laws and restrictions, as would deter his rising colony from imitating their errors and their abominations. These, together with the Phœnicians and Hebrews, are the four most ancient civilized nations on record ; but the religion of the other three was not subjected to the severe tests, by which the divine origin and credibility of that of the Hebrews were assayed. Enduring one continual circle of political changes,* conquered by fierce

and savage despots, as soon as they had settled^t themselves in Canaan, torn in subsequent times from their altars and their hearths, transplanted into the highest seat of idolatry then existing, they afforded ample proof, notwithstanding their many aberrations from the Mosaic law, that these revolutions could not make their religion extinct, that amidst all their hardships and wanderings they retained *still* recognizable, and *indeed*, indelible marks of their national peculiarity, and preserved that Pentateuch inviolate, to the forming instructions of which they were indebted for the preservation of all their records. Eichhorn, Michaëlis, and others, have attributed the survival of the sacred writings to the care, with which the Priests deposited them in the Temple, which, in fact, was a custom with every known nation of antiquity. Here, the genealogies and public registers found a place, as well as the oracles of the Prophets, affording one general point of reference for legal and sacred purposes; so that, although much has, assuredly, been lost from the several writers, through the vicissitudes to which the nation was exposed, we must nevertheless refer the existence of all that remains, to this salutary precaution.¹ But we must, at the same time, take into the account, that had not Cyrus permitted the re-settlement of the Jews on the Jordan, that had not such men as Ezra and Nehemiah been raised up by Providence to superintend the rising state, as well in temporals as in spirituals, all this solicitude for the safety of these MSS. had been frustrated, nor had a vestige survived the wreck of Hebrew literature on the shores of the Euphrates. Since that time, all that has escaped these desolations has been watched with an indefatigable diligence; and as laborious a method, as could have been devised, has been adopted to prevent interpolations or omissions in the sacred text. If we, therefore, consider our present Hebrew Scriptures as originally transcribed from the copies in the Tabernacle and Temple, and revised, as accurately as the materials would allow, by Ezra after the captivity and most probably collated with every MS. in the possession of the returned exiles; they must, with the exception of some few incidental variations, remain correct to this day, having been much better defended by the Masoretic scheme, than the writings of Homer, Pindar, Æschylus, and others, as we may easily perceive from the various transpositions, and unwarranted guesses of their several editors. We are enabled to arrive at this conclusion from the quotations

of the Mosaic Law in subsequent books, and from the relation of the same events in the books of the Kings, the Chronicles, and Isaiah, which could not agree the one with the other, were the case different. Yet many textual variations must exist, and that they *do* exist, we may ascertain from a collation of different MSS. ; but, these may reasonably have been expected to be more numerous, and in general they do not appear to affect any point of doctrine or of history. It is true that many divines of the German school affect either to allegorise a part of the Pentateuch into a *μῦθος*, or to determine it to be a late compilation : the first may be referred to the reveries of a fanciful mind, and the latter is absolutely defective in proof, and supported by no authority.—It is indeed a fact not a little singular, that the eastern and western copies of the Pentateuch exhibit the most striking similarity, and therefore correctness ; as any one, who will be at the pains of comparing the present *textus receptus* with the MS. brought from India, and now in the public library at Cambridge, may observe. But to a class of men, who seem systematically to scepticise, and apply arbitrary rules of criticism to Hebrew literature, abundant opportunities must present themselves from the many desideranda necessary rightly to analyse and explain a production of such ancient date.

No reasonable theologian can hesitate in supposing, that Moses had documents before him, of which he made use, in the history of events preceding his time :—his enumeration of the genealogical tables of the nation, of itself, would determine the question. Eichhorn has, in part, argued this from the title prefixed to Psalms lviil—viii—lix. (אל-תשחת) which appears to have been borrowed from Deut. ix. 26. ; but this cannot, in any way, be regarded either as an evidence or an objection. He says, “denn man könnte die Inschriften dieser Psalmen für zusätze späterer hände, oder das citirte hied für ein altes Volkslied erklären, das, ohne aufgeschrieben zu seyn, bloss von mund zu mund gegangen wäre ; sondern auf citationen eines GESCHRIEBENEN Ganzen.” To this hypothesis, however, demonstration is wanting.

To the proofs, which Eichhorn adduces, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, we can in general assent ; although we conceive many of his proofs “*from the style*,” (beweis aus ihrer sprache) very wild and absurd. That he wrote books, which pass under his name, whoever he or they may have been, who

reduced them to their present form, the contents of the Old Testament very satisfactorily determine! We discover Joshua i. 8. mentioning the ספר תורה, which he elsewhere particularises as the ספר תורת-משה, and Dâvid citing, as a thing well known, a *roll manuscript* (Ps. xl. 8. מגלת-ספר) in which the laws of offerings were specified, by which nothing else could be intended, than the law which we find in the Pentateuch. Similar mention is made of it in the historical books: 2 Kings xxii. 11. (דברי ספר) (התורה) 1 Chron. xvi. 10. (כל הכתוב בתורת יהוה) 2 Chron. xvii. 9. (ספר תורת יהוה) 2 Chron. xxxi. 3.; & xxxv. 26. (ככתוב) (ספר תורה) Nehem. viii. 3, 8, 18.; ix. 3. (ספר תורה). Such arguments as these contain sufficient and intrinsically solid force to establish them: his citation from the fortieth Psalm alone (8. v.) establishes his position, as David's allusion cannot be mistaken. The "MEGILLATH SEPHER" could, in this instance, be a name applicable to no other book, because the context restricts it to *this particular division* of the sacred records. "מגלת ספר" (says Rosenmüller,) volumen libri, h. e. liber, qui oblongis membranis convolvitur, nam, quemadmodum Latinis volumen a volvendo, ita Hebræis מגלת גלל convolvit, et adhuc Judæi non solum in libris, qui vulgata forma plicabilibus foliis constant, sed in Synagogis in oblongis membranis, quæ ex antiquo more super cylindrum seu axem ligneum in orbem circumvolvuntur, legem scriptam habent. Per hoc, autem, libri volumen Davidis tempore, cum hæc scriberet, intelligi aliud non potest, quam Pentateuchus." As Eichhorn well urges, the author of these books must have both lived and written at the time of the delivery of the law: a later writer must necessarily have been ignorant of many circumstances connected with it, which long prior to his day would have descended to oblivion.

Add to this, as we shall more fully exhibit in the sequel, that these books are quoted in many subsequent parts of scripture, in a great variety of which they are unequivocally referred to Moses. We ² trace extracts from the Genesis and the Exodus in Psalms civ. cv. cvi. cvii. which, with the preceding observations, amount almost to a positive conclusion; in David's last charge to Solomon, obedience to "the statutes, the commandments, the judgments and testimony of God, AS WRITTEN IN THE LAW OF MOSES," is strongly enforced: we may therefore define, without violence, the ספר תורה to be the corpus juris Mosaici, which was the standard of religion, and continued

¹ V. ii. pp. 246, 247. § 407.

² V. ii. p. 250. § 409.

to be such with Judah and Benjamin, after the revolt of the ten tribes. 'And, "with the exception of these five books, we discover none of the canonical scriptures of the Old Testament, among the descendants of the members of the *Israelitish* kingdom:" (*whereas*) "from this time to its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, there was, almost every fifty years, in the kingdom of Judah, a renewal of the law, and a reform of the worship of God undertaken, according to it." Hence (2 Chron. xvii. 9.) we remark Jehoshaphat commanding the Levites to instruct the people throughout all the cities of Judah from the ספר תורה, and (2 Chron. xxiii. 18.) Jehoiada the priest, as well as (2 Chron. xxxi. 3.) Hezekiah arranging, in times of great corruption, the worship of the Sanctuary, ככתוב בתורת משה. All of which wholesome regulations were neutralised² by Manasseh's irreligious reign; but, at the expiration of it, we see Josiah proceeding to a fresh reform according to the model (nach der vorschrist) of these books (2 Chron. xxxiv—xxxv.). We find Jeremiah admonishing his contemporaries to observe them, and Daniel (ix. 11.) citing their defection from them, as the cause of the captivity; at the termination of it, the service of God was arranged according to the precepts therein contained;³—the burnt offerings, the feast of Tabernacles, and of the new moon (Ezra iii. 2. et seqq.) were solemnised, ככתוב בתורת משה (Nehem. viii. 1, 3, 8, 14, 18.; ix. 3.).

The reasons produced in § 410 (dass Esras kann sie nicht abgefasst haben) that Ezra is not the author of the Pentateuch, are not to be answered; but we abstain from entering into the various minutiae of the question, in which he has indulged himself, in §§ 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, and content ourselves with transcribing a note from p. 267.: "Josephus in Antiq. Jud. lii. c. 19. § 9. gives the same explanation of the name Ματθαῖος. **UW** signifies in Coptic WATER, and **OYXE** to preserve from, or rescue. In משה the sound of the Egyptian word is only as well imitated as it could be; but משה means *extrahens*, not *extractus*, as we must interpret his name on the authority of Moses himself, (Ex. xxv. 10.) So likewise **OYBE-
PER** (Gen. xli. 43.) is artificially imitated in אנרך." Gentile historians corroborate the proofs which we extract from the writings themselves; and much has been collected, and yet

¹ V. ii. p. 251. 252. § 409.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

may be collected from the remains of Sanchoniatho preserved in Eusebius ;—if we had a perfect library of Egyptian and Ethiopic MSS., much more, illustrative of these times, would be discovered. We find the truth of Scriptural allusions in the pages of Herodotus, Diodorus, and Strabo ; and much more shall we ascertain, as we proceed in our acquaintance with Sanscrit literature, the key of all knowledge. Moses admits, in fact, the existence of certain ancient documents, when he makes mention of the SEPHER YASHER, the SEPHER MELACHEMOTH YEHOVAH, and the like ; and his intention was, undeniably, to write a true history of the Creation, brought down to his own time. Sacred stones, pillars, altars, and other memorials of primitive events, doubtless, were powerful auxiliaries to his undertaking ; but these, without such a compilation, as the historical parts of the ספר תורה, would soon have become the mere commemorators of uncertain tradition.

D. G. WAIT.

St. John's Coll. Cambridge.

NUGÆ.

No. IV.—[Continued from No. I. p. 354.]

Part of the lines prefixed by D. Heinsius to his books *De Contemptu Mortis*.

Μήτε βίον στυγέοιμι, κακῶν γεννήτορα πάντων,
μήτ' αὖ τὸν θάνατον, πᾶσιν ἀπεχθόμενον
ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐκτελέσαιμι τύχῃ κάρτιστα παλαίσας,
τὸν δ' αὖ προσβλέψας ἅντα προσερχόμενον
ἀμφοτέροις ἀτίνακτος ἔων καὶ ὁμοίους.

Compare Pope's Epitaph on Fenton :

Calmly he look'd on either life, and here
Saw nothing to regret, or there to fear.

In No. X. of the Retrospective Review, p. 220, notes, an anecdote of Edward I. while besieged at Conway, is given from an old chronicle : “ Et Rex habuit paucum de vino, quasi vix unam lagenam, et fecit miscere in aqua, et dare omnibus qui cum illo fuerunt ; et dixit : In necessitate omnia sunt communia, et omnes habebimus unam diætam donec Deus melius nobis suc-

currat." Is this a genuine anecdote, or a copy of similar stories in ancient writers?

Ib. p. 234. art. on Dr. H. More's Philosophical Poems.

Strange sights do struggle in my restless thought,
And lively forms with orient colours clad
Walk in my boundless mind————

This is perhaps the original of the most poetical passage in Gray :

Yet oft before his infant eyes would run
Such forms as glitter in the Muse's ray
With orient hues, unborrow'd of the Sun

The lines from Storer, in p. 279,

Nature hath powr'd enough in each man's lappe,
Could each man learne to use his private happe,
Are a translation from Claudian, Ruf. I.

————— Natura beatis

Omnibus esse dedit, si quis cognoverit uti.

The designation of time (p. 282.) " Now at such time as lawyers walke the streets," &c. in the manner of Homer : Od. M. ἡμος δ' ἐπὶ δόρπον ἀνὴρ ἀγορῇθεν ἀνέστη, Κρίνων νείκεα πολλὰ δικαζομένων αἰζηῶν, κ. τ. λ. Finally, the idea of the singular marriage ceremonies in p. 330—1 (quotation from Chapman) was very possibly (annotators ought never to be too positive) taken from Musæus, l. 274—282. * *Ἦν γάμος, ἀλλ' ἀχόρευτον ἦν λέχος, κ. τ. λ.* Chapman, as the translator of Homer, and continuator of Marlowe's poem of Hero and Leander, was probably not unacquainted with Musæus.

Jeremy Taylor's Sermon, " The House of Feasting," p. 288, vol. i. ed. 1817.

" Ebrius et petulans, qui nullum forte cecidit,
Dat pœnæ, noctem patitur lugentis amicum
Pelidæ.

[Juv. Sat. III.]

A drunkard and a glutton feels the torments of a restless night, *although he hath not killed a man* ; that is, just like murderers and persons of an affrighted conscience." This, and another still more curious mistranslation in the same page, with which we shall not trouble our reader, are instances of the ease with which the drift of a passage may be mistaken, when it is quoted from recollection, without regard to the context. Such petty oversights detract nothing from the reputation of a writer, whose learning would appear extraordinary, were it not accompanied by a genius still more wonderful. An error of the same

kind occurs in Potter's Antiquities, a work which in this respect, as in some others, is far from being sufficiently correct. Vol. II. p. 151, ed. 1775. (of the Naval Affairs of the Grecians.) "Being safely landed, they discharged whatever vows they had made to the Gods, besides which they usually offered a sacrifice called ἀποβατήριον, to Jupiter surnamed ἀποβατήριος — These devotions were sometimes paid to Nereus, Glaucus, &c.—more especially to Neptune—Thus the herpes in Homer (Od. Γ. 4.)

Αἱ [Οἱ] δὲ Πύλον, Νηληϊὸς εὐκτίμενον ποταλίεθρον,
 ἔξον· τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης ἱερὰ ῥέζον
 ταύρους παμμέλανας Ἐνοσίχθονι κυανοχαίτῃ."

The meaning is, "They (the Pylians, understood from Πύλον) were, at the time the Ithacans landed, sacrificing to Neptune on the shore." Potter's translation militates with the grammar of the passage, as well as with the context.

In a copy of Virgil which is in our possession, an over-officious hand has taken the trouble to fill up some of the unfinished verses. One of these attempts is worth transcribing: Æn. X. 16.

————— at non Venus aurea contra

Pauca refert; neque enim contenta est femina paucis.

The sarcasm, at least, is worthy of Virgil.

Blomf. Gloss. in Agam. 61. (πολύανδρος ἀμφὶ γυναικός.) Does not Lycophron somewhere call Helen τὴν πεντέγαμβρον? We have not the means of referring to the passage; it may be a slip of our memory, as probably as of Dr. Blomfield's, who has only quoted one passage of Lycophron on the occasion, l. 851, after Stanley.—Gloss on l. 81. We quote a sentence of this note, as illustrative of the connexion between certain passages from various writers, quoted by Cæcilius Metellus, in the Misc. Class., which the writer in Blackwood¹ was so much at a loss to discover. "Poetis autem mos est, quum tropum paullo audaciorem adhibent, epithetum statim adjungere, quod notionem ejus circumscribat ac definiat."—l. 869 sqq.—Of this beautiful passage there is an animated translation in Mr. Mitchell's article

¹ Having alluded to one of the Magazines, we take the opportunity of referring to a passage in the London Magazine for March, (we think p. 226.) containing some judicious observations respecting the dolphin of the ancients. The whole article (a narrative of a sea-voyage) is well worth perusal. We may likewise be allowed to recommend the Life of J. War-ton, in the same number.

in the Quarterly on the Female Character in Greece. Mr. M.
has, however, by mistake attributed it to Sophocles.

From the Song of Moses.

Μέλψω βασιλεῖ πρίσβιστα μελῶν,
ὃς ἀνικήτω χερὶ καλλιστεῖ
ἤνεγκε κλέους, καὶ πανσυρδὴν
ἵππους τε βαλὼν ἵππων τ' ἐπόχους
δίναις ἔκρυψ' ἀλίσισι.
στέρξω δὲ Θεόν· καλέσω νιν ἐμῆς
ισχύν τε βιάς, μοῦσαν θ' ὕμνων,
ἐν τ' ἀμφιλαφεῖ σωτήρα κακῶ·
τῷ δ' ὑψιβατὸν δόμον ἀσκήσω
πάσαις αὐγαῖς, κόσμων τε χλιδαῖς·
ὃς ἐμοὶ τ' ἄλκῃ προγόνοισι τ' ἐμοῖς,
ἔρμ' ἐν δεινοῖς ἀστυφέλικτον,
λόγχης πρόβλημ' ἀνεφάνθη·
πολέμου δὲ μέδει· ΚΤΡΙΟΣ αὐτῷ
πρόκλημ' ἐν ἐμαῖς
κεῖται μούσαις πολύευκτον.
ὃς νῦν τάγου λαὸν ἀναγνοῦ,
δίφρους τ' ἄμυδι· περίρρυμα τέλη,
τούς τ' ἐκλεκτοὺς βασιλεως ὑπόχους
γλαυκὴ ξυνέμιξε θαλάσση.
πόντος δ' ἐκάλυψ', ἐς δ' εὐρυπόρου
βένη λίμνης, οἷόν τε λίθος,
κατέδυσσεν στρατιά· σὺ δὲ χειρὶ, Πάτερ,
κλέος ἤνεγκας, τὴν δ' ἀντιπάλων
ὑπεροπλίαν ἀνομούς τε λόγους
ἤϊστωσας, πομπὴν δὲ ταχύν
πέριψας ὄργην, ὥσπερ τ' ὄροφον
μαλερῇ ῥιπῇ κατέφλεξας
μέλπει· ἀνακτι πρίσβιστα μελῶν,
ὃς ἀνικήτω χερὶ καλλιστεῖ
ἤνεγκε κλέους, καὶ πανσυρδὴν
ἵππους τε βαλὼν, ἵππων τ' ἐπόχους,
δίναις ἔκρυψ' ἀλίσισιν.

In Samson Agonistes, 675 sqq.

Nor do I name of men the common rout;
But such as thou hast solemnly elected,
With gifts and graces eminently adorn'd
To some great work

'Adorn'd' is here used in the Latin sense; furnished, or supplied with requisites for the work. So Jereny Taylor, in his first sermon on Marriage; 'The Apostle therefore, who himself had been a married man—does explicate the mysteriousness of it, and describes its honors, and adorns it with rules and provisions of religion,' &c. Dryden in his translation of the exordium of Lucretius, borrows the words, but applies them in a different sense:

Thy Memmius, under thy bright influence born,
Whom thou with all thy gifts and graces dost adorn.

NUCATOR.

NOTICE OF

JOURNAL of a TOUR in the LEVANT. By WILLIAM
TURNER, Esq., in three Volumes Octavo.

THIS work, which modestly presents itself as a 'Tour in the Levant,' comprehends the remarks of an accomplished and ingenious traveller on so many countries, and those so eminently interesting from various circumstances, that it might justly have assumed a title of much more lofty pretension:—for Mr. Turner visited not only the European and Asiatic coasts, and principal islands of the Mediterranean Sea, but explored the classic regions of Greece; Egypt with its mysterious antiquities; and Palestine, consecrated among Christians as the scene of events most awfully important. It is manifest from several passages scattered through these volumes, that he could ably have fulfilled his original intention of illustrating the observations which he had himself actually made, by a comparison with descriptions extracted from Homer, Strabo, Pausanias, Diodorus Siculus, and other ancient writers; but to examine with due attention all that they have left us, and all that modern travellers and antiquaries have published concerning the different countries above mentioned, is a task of such magnitude as seems sufficient to appal even a veteran drudge in literary labors; and had our young author consulted us, we should have agreed with those friends who advised him (as his preface, p. x, informs us) to

relinquish so extensive a design, and to publish his Journal 'as nearly as possible in the form in which it was originally written.' This advice he has happily followed; and at a moment when every information respecting the Greeks and Turks must, from the nature of their present contest, be particularly acceptable, we are in possession of such authentic and curious anecdotes, illustrating their manners, customs, and opinions, as we could not possibly have received for two or three years more, had he persevered in his original intention. This work is evidently a faithful transcript of his Journal; written while each daily impression was fresh, and therefore worth a hundred recollections; Mr. Turner relates, in a lively and pleasing manner, various minute circumstances which might have escaped the notice of a less intelligent and observant traveller, yet serve, very materially, to display the true character of those who at present inhabit Greece, Syria, Egypt, and other countries, unfortunately suffering under Turkish barbarism; and amidst the venerable remains of their former greatness, at Athens or Jerusalem, at the Troad or the Pyramids, he contrives, without any affectation of profound research or antiquarian cant, to impart useful information as well as entertainment—and the writer of this notice, who has himself visited some, though not all of the places through which Mr. Turner travelled, can so far bear ample testimony to the accuracy of his descriptions and the justness of his remarks; whilst in this respect, he finds the opinions of two or three ingenious friends, who have explored the other countries, equally favorable.

We proceed to state, that having obtained an appointment in the Embassy to Constantinople, under Mr. (now Sir Robert) Liston, our author embarked in April, 1812, on board the *Argo*, passed seven days at Cadiz, inspected Gibraltar, and remained long enough at Palermo to collect materials for a very amusing account of that city, and some excellent observations on Sicilian manners; the excessive profligacy of the higher classes, and the abject misery and poverty of the lower. Marriage is considered by the women merely as a cloak for licentiousness; all the agricultural and commercial interests of the island are sacrificed to the luxury of the capital, near which the roads are good, while the interior is almost impervious; the nobles gambling away their fortunes in Palermo, totally neglect their estates in the country—and this ancient granary of the Roman empire had been, a short time previous to Mr. T.'s visit, in imminent danger of a famine. To this neglect among the nobles is added the rapacity of the priests.

'And thus the people are so oppressed and plundered, that perhaps no instance can be found of a nation enjoying the reputation of being civilised, and presenting every where such scenes of misery.' (Vol. I. p. 25.)

Malta, and the island of Milo with its hot-springs, and ancient ruins, among which our author discovered and copied some Greek inscriptions, must not detain us from the Plain of Troy, (p. 36.) where he found reason to commend in the strongest manner Sir William Gell's 'extraordinarily accurate descriptions and drawings.' He passed through the paltry village of Koum Kali, and crossed the rivers Simois and Scamander below their junction, where they were (on the 16th of June) about fifty feet wide, and knee deep; in the heap of stones called Hector's Tomb, a large hole, seen by one of Mr. T.'s party eighteen years before, was now filled up with wild fig-trees. Some of immense size abound in this neighbourhood. The Simois is beautifully bordered by trees of the richest foliage. The English gentlemen dined and passed the night in Bounarbashi, at the Aga's house, where they breakfasted next day under an arbour of vines in his garden, said to occupy the site of Priam's. (P. 38.) Some women of the village, washing at one source of the river Scamander, reminded Mr. Turner of Homer, who describes the Trojan dames assembled there for the same purpose in time of peace. (Iliad. xxii. 155.) At Alexandria Troas he copied some Greek inscriptions, and examined the ancient aqueduct, remains of a gate, a theatre and bath—but the Turks are daily reducing these ruins, whence they derive materials for the stone balls discharged from the batteries round Constantinople, and for their buildings in the vicinity. (P. 40.) At the Asiatic town of the Dardanelles (called Abydos by Europeans) Mr. T. crept with ease into the great gun which fired stone shots at our fleet in 1806; it lies immoveable on the ground: the diameter of its bore is two feet; it requires sixty-three okes (each oke 2½ lbs.) of powder, and its stone ball weighs one hundred and forty two okes. Here Lord Byron's experiment excited our author's curiosity on the subject of Leander's exploit; and he attempted to swim across from Asia to Europe; but so strong and adverse was the current, that after twenty-five minutes of violent exertion, he had not advanced above an hundred yards, and desisted. He is convinced that no man could swim a mile and a half (the breadth in the narrowest part of the strait) against such a current—whereas the task is comparatively easy from the European side.

'I therefore,' says he, 'treat the tale of Leander's swimming across both ways, as one of those fables to which the Greeks were so ready to

give the name of history; *quidquid Græcia mendax audet in historia.*' (P. 45.)

We must be brief in noticing the arrival at Constantinople, and the British Ambassador's audience of the Sultan, whose letter to the Kaimakam, or officer representing the Grand Vizier (then absent), ordered him to 'feed, wash and clothe the infidels, and bring them to him.' Indeed such are the studied insults to which every ambassador from a Christian Sovereign is exposed on his introduction to this barbarian despot, that it is difficult to conceive why the governments of Europe submit so tamely to the degradation of their representatives—the more, as it does not by any means serve to advance the conduct of their negotiations. Mr. Éton (in his Survey of the Turkish Empire,) relates that the French Ambassador in 1700, (Mons. de Ferioles,) did not obtain an audience of the Sultan because he would not take off his sword, yet 'he remained a dozen years longer at Constantinople, and transacted the business of his office with credit to himself and advantage to his country.' After some very judicious observations on the Turkish government, the character and policy of the Sultan, the system of dragomans or interpreters attached to European missions; the extraordinary establishment of Janizaries, the plague, the dogs that infest Constantinople, the population of that great city, (perhaps, including the suburbs, between six and seven hundred thousand souls, to support which the provinces are often drained after a severe plague,) and various other subjects, Mr. Turner begins the account of his journey to Greece. (P. 93.) On this expedition he set out from Constantinople (or Pera, close to it) in August 1813, and returned to the same place in July of the year immediately following. The principal objects which he visited during this expedition were, the islands of Tino, Zanta, Cephalonia, and Ithaca; Patrass, Lepanto, Prevesa, Arta, Yoannina, the celebrated residence of Ali Pasha, Mount Pindus, from the summit of which were visible Olympus, Thermopylæ and Parnassus, with the Achelous and Peneus, now inconsiderable streams; he passed a month at Tripolizza; then proceeded to Argos, the ruins of Mycenæ, Corinth, Salona, Delphi, Mount Parnassus, Livadia, Thebes, the remains of Plateæ, and Athens. We cannot follow our ingenious author closely through all these places, most of which have afforded him subjects of pleasing communication, curious anecdote, or instructive remark. •Near Previsa he examined the ruins of Nicopolis, where had been a temple of Apollo, and two theatres: of the smaller he says;—

'This was the most interesting remnant of antiquity I had yet seen,

and gave me the best idea of a Roman Theatre: but I could not help being astonished at the smallness of the stage, which could not have been above fifteen feet wide, nor more than eight deep. I found a few copper medals, &c.' (P. 109.)

At Argivocastro Mr. T. had an interview with Ali Pasha, and was most graciously received. His Highness spoke with much regard of Mr. Liston, the ambassador, mentioned a very flattering letter he had received from Mr. Canning, when Secretary of State, and wished that all Englishmen should consider Albania as their home; and this most aspiring and ferocious tyrant spoke of Bonaparte's ambition and cruelty, which he said it was necessary to curb. (P. 128.) In consequence of the Pasha's invitation, our author visited him at Tepelën, where an apartment in the palace, magnificently furnished, (the same which Lord Byron and Mr. Hobhouse had before occupied) was allotted for his accommodation.

'Dinner, consisting of eighteen dishes, was soon brought in on a large tin tray, about three feet diameter, which was laid on a reversed stool, and placed by us as we sat on the sofa, while a page of the Vizir (as Ali Pasha is entitled) laid on our shoulders fine napkins splendidly embroidered. This page's story was very romantic; and the beauty of his person added to its interest; his father was the chief of the Suliotes, who fought against Ali Pasha for eighteen years with a handful of men (not above 5000), and caused him a loss of 20,000 troops. On being taken he was ostensibly pardoned; but he died suddenly a year ago, it is strongly suspected, by poison; his son, though apparently a great favorite of the Vizir, is daily apprehensive of the same fate.' (P. 134.)

We revert to p. 130, where a note informs us that the history of this Suliote war with Ali Pasha had been published in the Romaic, or modern Greek language, and recorded instances of individual, and particularly of female courage, truly wonderful: we regret that Mr. Turner did not complete the translation of it, which, as we learn, he had commenced. At Zante he was obliged to perform quarantine, and amused himself in the lazaretto by reading books and newspapers lent to him by

'Prince Commiutti, (son-in-law of Mr. Foresti,) who was an adept in reading English, though he could not speak it. An old Zantiote, named Bona Nicolas, (a common appellation for old men among the Greeks,) was sent to me as a servant by Mr. F., and provided for my cookery and bedding with tolerable comfort. On a subsequent examination of my baggage, I found he had plundered it unconscionably. He carried on this system of robbery till he was detected, and flogged round the island by order of General Campbell, who would have been justified by law in hanging him for the offence that entailed his punishment, viz. delivering stolen articles to an accomplice out of the lazaretto, by which he might have introduced the plague into the island. It was, however, for this act of justice that General C. was arraigned in the house of Commons as a lawless tyrant.' (P. 171.)

Similar charges we have lately seen preferred against the

successor of General Campbell, and probably with as little foundation; the difficulty of governing by gentle means such people as the inhabitants of Zante will appear from a few anecdotes related in the work before us, but not more unfavorable to their character than many others that we have heard well authenticated from other quarters. The island contains about 37,000 souls—the nobles agree only in tyrannising over the lower classes.

‘Hereditary quarrels,’ says Mr. T., ‘are carried among them to a dreadful pitch; and while there I saw a man hung for assisting a father to murder his son. I suppose one might defy the whole world to produce such instances of villany as are acted in the Seven Islands. The most revolting and unnatural crimes are common; and were almost entirely overlooked by the Venetian and Septinsular governments, to whom, indeed, the selling of impunity or of pardon was a common source of emolument. A Zantiote nobleman not long ago, on his deathbed, pistolled his own brother; another administered a slow poison to the only son of a rival, as the most bitter vengeance he could take on the father. The poor boy survived, but is to this day a wretched object from its effect. In short it would be equally impossible and needless to enumerate their crimes. There are only two classes, the very rich and the very poor. The former are constantly intriguing to remove from office or to murder each other; and the latter are such submissive retainers to them, from fear or bribery, as to be always the ready instruments of their vengeance.’ (P. 180.)

Such are the nobles of this island, where the poor see nothing in their clergy but voluptuousness and rapacity, and in their legislative bodies nothing but chicanery, deceit and delay. Under the former government it was usual for the nobility to employ privateers, by which they intercepted the commerce, and plundered the property of their own countrymen.

‘As General Campbell was one day riding out he saw four men creeping behind a wall on the side of the road, and called them to him; they said they would come round the wall, but made off as quickly as they could, and he soon saw them escaping in a boat to the Morea. Unfortunately he was attended only by a servant, so that far from being able to take them, he may be considered to have had a fortunate escape. Next morning word was brought to him that these men had shot three boys who were gathering olives. Little doubt was entertained that they had been employed by some Zantiote nobleman to destroy the objects of his displeasure, and large rewards were offered for their apprehension, but hitherto without success. The present laws are Venetian; great delay takes place in the execution of justice, trials frequently lasting three or four years. Two years had been occupied in the trial of the man whom I saw executed; and, at the gallows, though long urged to confess, he insisted that he was only an accessory, and that the two principals (the father and brother), who had actually committed the murder, had been acquitted. They fled the island immediately after the trial was finished. It is to be hoped that English laws will soon be introduced here as at Malta; but in the interval (before the national character and the government of the Ionian islands is settled) the governor is in a great difficulty, having no standard to guide himself; as he cannot consi-

88. *Notice of Turner's Tour in the Levant.*

tently employ English authority to administer the unjust and partial laws of Venice, and no others are yet established. Every mode of conciliation is adopted; and the national and religious prejudices of the islanders are as much consulted as is consistent with good government. It was amusing enough to see the seriousness with which our soldiers joined and carried candles in the church processions.' (P. 181.)

The indifference of the Zantiotes with respect to assassination, may be understood from an anecdote recorded in p. 208. An old man, who had fled ten years before, in consequence of having committed two horrible murders, returned to secure some property, and quarrelling with his wife, beat her severely. She complained to the Capo di Governo, and General Campbell by this circumstance, discovered who he was, and instantly ordered him to be hanged.

'When the order was communicated to him he exclaimed, 'What! would you hang me now in my old age?' and several nobles of Zante remonstrated against the iniquity of punishing a crime so long after its commission; but as they could not bring the General to acquiesce in such an absurdity, the man was hanged. A Turk, then in Zante, at whose village in the Morea this wretch had been long living, came to beg his reprieve, but was told to his great astonishment, that the Sultan himself could not avert the execution of justice in Zante.'

Mr. Turner notices many abuses by which the nobles in Zante and throughout the Ionian islands, oppressed the lower orders, whom General Campbell effectually protected against them—in consequence of which, the nobles have sent complaints to England of the severity practised by the British authorities, whilst the poorer classes invariably express the happiness and security they enjoy under our protection. (P. 211.) The reader will be glad to learn, that through the unwearied exertions of General Campbell, who employed Mr. Turner in the affair, three of the four assassins, who murdered the poor boys above mentioned, were discovered at Corinth, and after a desperate resistance, one was killed, and another wounded, who with the third, and the head of the dead murderer, was sent to Zante; and the execution of these villains is said to have put an end to the practice of assassination in this island; the fourth suffered death at Gastouni for a murder committed there. We cannot here trace our author in his antiquarian researches at Delphi, where he copied some inscriptions, nor at Thebes, of which he gives a view neatly etched, nor at Argos, which he thinks still entitled to the epithet bestowed on it by Homer, on account of the beauty of its women, καλλιγύναικα; nor at Mycenæ, where he again bears witness to Sir William Gell's accuracy of delineation. But we shall rest with him a moment at Athens, which he entered

'by the gate of a miserable wall that surrounds it, and rode imme-

diately through streets of wretched houses, to the house of Signor Logotheti, whose son is English consul; almost every Greek as we passed saluting me with *Kalós ðpfere* (welcome) *ἑστία* (equivalent to Sir in Turkish.) My friend T. and the consul's father gave me a cordial welcome, and came immediately to shake hands with me. Lodgings were soon found for me at the house of a Signor Vitali, where I am very comfortable, and have a fine view of the temple of Theseus, which I saw to my right as I entered the town. I went immediately with T. to visit the three Graces of Athens, the Consolinas, (so called from their father's having been English vice-consul here) Mariana, Catharina, and Theresa. The two eldest are fine girls; but the youngest is very pretty. She is the *Ζών μου σὺς ἀγαπῶ* of Lord Byron. It is considered a sort of duty for English travellers to fall in love with one of the sisters. The eldest speaks a little Italian, and understands something of English. They are excessively poor, and are strong instances of the discordance that is too frequently found between Nature and Fortune. They maintain themselves by working in embroidery. I then walked with T. round the ruins; first to the Temple of Theseus, which is within the walls; then (conceive my delight) I stood on the Pnyx where Demosthenes spoke his orations to the Athenians; to the Areopagus, to Mount Museum, from which I saw Salamis, and the mountain where, it is said, Xerxes sat to view the battle; to the Odeum, and to the columns of Adrian's Pantheon, or of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, (for opinions are divided as to which of these edifices they belonged,) and re-entered the city by Adrian's arch, which now forms a gate of the city. Wherever I moved was some monument of antiquity, even over the doors of the Greeks were basso-relievos. These ruins have all been so amply and ably described, that it would be presumptuous in me to enlarge on them. I entered Athens exactly at noon, and I shall ever look on the 15th of May as a holiday. I dined with T., passed the evening with the Consolinas, and at midnight lay down, and being very tired, slept soundly. But it is a shame to speak of one's self at Athens.' (P. 323.)

In another number of this journal we propose to conclude our account of Mr. Turner's interesting work. The first volume, which we have here abruptly closed, contains a neat and excellent map of Greece and the Archipelago, by Walker—a colored frontispiece representing the mode of travelling in Turkey, very accurately designed—a beautiful view of Zante, also colored, and other plates.

An Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology, to which is added, A Critical Examination of the remains of Egyptian Chronology. By J. C. PRICHARD, M. D.

THE general scope and design of this work are analogous to those of the *Pantheon Ægyptiorum* of the learned Jablonksi;

to whom the author acknowledges himself to be under considerable obligations.

He differs from that writer with respect to the reliance placed by him on Coptic Etymologies, and dissents from the numerous conclusions, which Jablonski has derived chiefly from that source. The author of the present work places his confidence almost exclusively on the testimony of ancient Authors, and has therefore been careful to assemble in the examination of each topic, all the important information that can be derived from antiquity respecting it. Many subjects are also farther elucidated by a comparison of parallel passages in the Hindoo, and other systems of mythology, but all these portions are inserted in notes or supplements to the several chapters, in order to prevent the introduction into the body of the work of materials, the intimate relation of which to the Egyptian mythology, may be thought to rest upon hypothetical or questionable grounds. In his method of explaining the Egyptian Mythi he has adopted in a great measure the principles of that school of critics, of which Heyne may be considered as the head, and to which his writings have contributed to give an extensive prevalence upon the Continent. These writers agree with the ancient stories in regarding the fictions of ancient mythology in general, as founded chiefly on physical theories or speculative attempts to explain the origin of things, and the phenomena of the visible Universe. Dogmas of this description, mixed with moral allegories, were clothed during the infancy of science and philosophy in a mystical garb, and adorned with poetical imagery. The powers of Nature were described under prosopopœias, and these gave origin to the personages of mythology, whose fabulous adventures have, in many instances, been successfully resolved by Heyne and his followers into representations of some remarkable fact, or theory relating to physics or astronomy. The author of the present work supposes the most striking and conspicuous part of the Egyptian mythology to have been of this description, and therefore allied in its nature to the fables of the Greeks and Romans; but he considers all this portion to have been an addition or superstructure raised on the basis of a more recondite system of principles, derived from a corruption of patriarchal or primitive revelation. This general idea of the composition of the Egyptian mythology has furnished the author with the division of his two first books. In the former he treats of the popular religion of the Egyptians; comprehending their theogony, and the fabulous history of their gods. In book the 2d he inquires into their philosophical

doctrine—cosmogony—their notions respecting the soul and the future state, and the moral government of the world. In a third book the religion of Egypt is compared with that of the Hindoos, and other oriental nations, and an attempt is made to trace its history through succeeding æras of degradation and corruption, corresponding to those successive changes which the religion of the Brahmins has been shown to have undergone, by the researches of Messrs. Schlegel, Colebrooke, and other eastern scholars. The 4th book surveys the exoteric or popular religion of the Egyptians, describes the worship of animals, the pomps and processions in honor of the divinities, the sacrifices and rites in the temples, all those parts of religion which may be supposed to have been most influential on the characters of the people. The work concludes with a long chapter containing a comparison of the Egyptian rites, and the ordinances of Moses.

Having thus given a general summary of the principal divisions of this work, we proceed to survey the materials which are employed in filling up its different parts.

After a copious introduction on the sources of information respecting the Egyptian literature and philosophy, we come to the first chapter of the first book, 'on the nature of the Egyptian gods in general.' After an appeal to a variety of ancient authorities, among which those of Chæremon and Jamblicus are chiefly distinguished, we are conducted to the conclusion, at the end of the 4th section, that the worship of the Egyptians was directed towards physical objects, or the departments and powers of Nature. 'The Egyptians, as Jamblicus asserts in the passage above quoted, considered every part of the visible universe as endowed with an inherent life, energy, and intelligence; they worshipped the intelligent and active cause of the phenomena of Nature, as it is displayed in its most striking and powerful agencies, but as we shall hereafter find reason to conclude, without accurately discriminating the cause from the effect; or they believed as men seem naturally prone to imagine, that the elements were themselves animated. 'Such,' says Eusebius, 'was the doctrine of the Egyptians, from whom Orpheus deriving his theology, represented the universe as a god, formed or composed of a number of subordinate divinities, as integrant parts of himself; for we have already shown,' he adds, 'that the Egyptians reckoned the departments of the world itself as gods.' The operations of the elements, described in a mystical and poetical style, were perhaps mistaken by the vulgar; for the adventures of gods or demons; but the original sense of these theogonical fables

would appear to have been merely physical, or founded on that species of paganism, which Eusebius declares to be the most ancient, namely, the worship of Nature. Barbarous nations have ever regarded storms, winds, and the moving bodies in the heavens, as animated and guided by genii; and the same superstition, decorated, and reduced to a system of mystical representations, appears to have been the popular religion of the most cultivated nations of antiquity.

In the remaining section of this chapter the same general notion respecting the Egyptian superstition is illustrated by reference to the remains of the sacred poems of the Greeks, the Orphic fragments, and other materials known to have been derived from the Egyptian sources.

In the 2d chapter the author proceeds to a particular examination of the worship of the Egyptian triad. Osiris is shown to be the genial, or productive power in Nature; Typhon is the destroyer, and Aroueris, or the elder Horus, the renovator. The male divinities represent the active elements; the goddesses Isis and Nephthys, consorts of Osiris and Typhon, typify the passive or sublunary departments of the world, or the physical attributes ascribed to them. Osiris and Isis, under a particular relation which is analysed, become the sun and moon, and the legend of their adventures is thought by the author, as it was by Plutarch, Macrobius, Jablonski, and Dupuis, to refer to the progress of the sun and moon along their courses. The Isiac and Osiriac festivals are considered in their relation to the seasons, to the phenomena of which the voice of all antiquity, with one exception, refers them. That exception is found in a passage of Geminus of Rhodes, who censures Eudoxus and the Greeks in general, for supposing that the feast of Isis corresponded exactly with the winter solstice, and intimates that this solemnity altered its place in the seasons, with the changes of the vague year. But a great mass of evidence favors the opinion that Eudoxus was correct, and gives reason to believe Geminus was imperfect in his information. These authorities are cited at full in the work before us. The subject has also been considered by Messrs. Humboldt and Jognard.

The vivifying principle in Nature seems not to be exclusively in the sun. Accordingly all other genial elements are forms of, or emanations from Osiris. Such was the fertilising Nile, whose consort was Isis, the fecundated soil of Egypt. Nephthys was the abode of death, the parched desert, where Typhon or the burling Simvom raged. When these arid tracts were overflowed and fertilised by an unusual inundation,

then Osiris was said to leave his garlands of Melilotus in the bed of Nephthys. Horus like Osiris had the emblems of generation. The attributes of the three persons in the triad, were more naturally arranged by the Egyptians than by the Hindoos, who combined the generative and destructive powers in one personification, although in detail, Maha-Hala, the destroyer, is distinguished from Iswara, when he assumes the attributes of generation.

In the remaining chapters of the first book, all that can be collected from the ancients respecting the inferior Egyptian gods and goddesses, has been brought together; we have reason to regret the want of sufficient data for certain conclusions, but in general it seems that the gods resolve themselves into various forms of Osiris and Typhon, and the goddesses into forms of Isis and Nephthys. Serapis is Osiris as god of the nether world, and bears a relation to the sun, after his descent into the southern hemisphere.

The 2d book commences with an inquiry into the esoteric philosophy of the Egyptians; their notions respecting the Supreme Deity and the origin of the world. We learn chiefly from Jamblicus and Eusebius, that the Egyptians asserted the existence of an eternal immutable Spirit, whom they term Enph or Chuphis, and represented under the form of a serpent. According to Porphyry this god was worshipped in a 'statue of human form and dark azure complexion, holding in his hand a girdle and a sceptre, wearing upon his head a royal plume, and thrusting an egg out of his mouth.' By the egg, as we learn in a passage in the Evangelical Preparation, was meant the world, and with it was produced a secondary or generated god, who was both masculine and feminine. In the masculine character he is termed Phtha, or Vulcan the Demiurgus; and in the feminine Neith, or Minerva; and by this divinity the visible universe was formed out of the chaotic egg. Phtha is identified with Osiris. We have here an exact counterpart of the generation of the Hindoo Brahma, from the substance of the eternal Brahman.

In chapter the 2d the doctrine of the alternate destructions and renovations of the world, which was held by several of the Grecian schools, is analysed, and nearly all the passages of the ancient writers in which it is contained, are cited. This doctrine is ascribed to the Egyptians chiefly on the evidence of the fact, that Egypt appears to have been the source whence the Grecian philosophers who taught it, derived their instructions. It is expressly ascribed to the Egyptians by the author of the

Asclepian dialogue, and by inference in some passages of Syncellus. In a supplement to the same chapter, the ideas of the Hindoos, and some other nations on this subject, are compared with those of the Greeks and Egyptians.

The opinion that at stated periods of whatever duration, the whole universe was destined to be destroyed, and all finite beings to be resolved into the essence of the Deity, has an obvious connexion with the future state of the soul. It is asserted in the old Hermaic books cited by Eusebius, but now lost, that all individual souls are emanations from the one soul of the universe, and it seems to have been the general opinion of antiquity, that after a limited period of separate existence, they are re-fused into the source from whence they originated. It is not certain, though very probable, that the Egyptians held this opinion; their doctrines respecting the fate of the soul are considered by the author in the 3d chapter of the second book. He adheres to the testimony of Herodotus, which represents them as believing in the Metempsychosis, and rejects the opinion of the President de Goguet and Schlegel, who have ascribed to them a doctrine analogous to that of the resurrection of the body. The testimony of the Pseudo Hermes is again adverted to on this subject, who in the book intituled *Clavis*, speaks of the transmigration of souls into animals.

Book the third is an attempt to trace an outline of the history of this mythology, and to illustrate it by reference to the sacred books of the Hindoos. The author begins with a sketch taken from the writings of Schlegel and Colebrooke, of the history of Hindoo Mythology; the religion of the Hindoos is traced through four successive eras. In the oldest representations which are found in their sacred books, it appears comparatively but little corrupted from the faith of the Patriarchs; the doctrine, however, of the transmigration and emanation of souls, is referred to this period; the age of Pantheism succeeds. The introduction of Astrolatry and the worship of Nature in its various parts, follows in the natural progress of corruption. The doctrine of two principles, or the eternal warfare of light and darkness, Vice and Virtue, established by the elder Zoroaster, seems to have been a partial attempt at reformation, and to revive the ideas of antiquity. This was a Persian and not an Indian school; but with what propriety it is introduced into the succession of Indian doctrines, we shall leave to the reader to inquire. In the 3d chapter of this book the author compares at length the several parts of Hindoo and Egyptian Mythology; he points out a similar progress in the history of the latter; the observations

on this subject we have not room to analyse; he concludes with general inferences respecting the origin and history of mythology; he thinks he has proved analytically, that the first mythology was a corruption of revealed religion; 'the first step,' he observes, 'towards the corruption of this simple form of theology, seems to have been the attempt to adorn it with the fragments of philosophy, according to that style of philosophising that was suited to the genius of the old age. It is to this period that we must refer most of the pagan cosmogonies. Many of them contain the doctrine, that the world was created by the voluntary agency of the Supreme; but this idea was not enough to satisfy curiosity, and we find it often blended with some fanciful analogies derived from natural processes that are daily observed. The production of an organised world was compared by some to the germination of seeds; an idea which occurs in the institutes of Menu, and in some of the representations of the Grecian schools. Hence also the celebrated fiction of the mundane egg, or the egg produced spontaneously in the womb of Erebus, containing in itself the elements which were afterwards distributed into the various departments of the world.

'To the same childish fondness for analogies and illustrations, we must attribute that description of the demiurgus, or creative power, which represents him as comprising in himself two sexes, and producing all subordinate creatures by the way of generation. On this subject enough has been said in the foregoing pages. Another important step in the progress of superstition, and one which seems to have led the way to the establishment of the first pagan worship, was the habit of resolving the doctrine of emanation into those descriptions of the Deity which verge towards pantheism. These two theories are so nearly allied, that the former naturally degenerates into the latter, while the pantheistic representation of the divinity involves or leads inevitably to the deification of material beings, as particularly of the more striking and conspicuous objects in the visible universe. To the same style of philosophy belong the personification of the most remarkable powers of nature, the consecration of emblems, some of them the most obscene, as types or symbols of those powers, the decorated pomps and gorgeous superstitions of the pagan world, and all the prodigious abominations in which a corrupt religion emulated and exceeded the actual depravity of men. All these innovations produced a mist, which darkened the eyes of the victims of superstition, and concealed from them those principles which

were still recognised by the learned as the basis of their religious system.'

The 4th book commences with the ceremonies connected with the worship of animals in Egypt, which forms a remarkable feature in the superstition of that country. 'It was remarked by Clemens and Origen, that those who visited Egypt approached with delight its sacred groves and splendid temples, adorned with superb vestibules and lofty porticos, the scene of many solemn and mysterious rites. The walls, says Clemens, shine with gold and silver, and with amber, and sparkle with the various gems of India and Ethiopia; and the recesses are concealed by splendid curtains. But if you enter the penetralia, and inquire for the image of the god, for whose sake the fane was built; one of the Pastaphori, or some other attendant on the temple, approaches with a solemn and mysterious aspect, and putting aside the veil, suffers you to peep in, and obtain a glimpse of the divinity. There you behold a snake, a crocodile, or a cat, or some other beast, a fitter inhabitant of a cavern or bog, than of a temple.'

After some general observations on the worship of animals, the author proceeds under each head to collect the accounts which the ancients have left.—Section 3d, on the worship of quadrupeds—of the ox-kind; including the rites of Apis, Mnevis, and other sacred bulls, and of the cow dedicated to Isis—2dly, the worship of dogs—3dly, of cats—4th of the wolf—5th of the ram—6th of the goat—7th of the worship of the deer—8th of monkeys and apes—9th of the ichneumon—10th of the shrew mouse—11th of the lion—12th of the hippopotamus—13th of impure animals.

Section 4th—of the worship of birds: 1st, of the hawk—2d, of the crow—3dly, of the vulture—4th of the eagle—5th, of the ibis—6th, of the goose.

Section 5th, on fabulous birds, which are traced in the Egyptian Mythology, contains remarks on the phoenix, and in a note, a citation from Bede, which proves that that author understood the phoenix, in a passage of Job, which has often been referred to of late, '*fieri ergo potest ut Beatus Job in similitudinem avis illius dicat, se post mortem in carnis cinere velut in nido pro tempore futurum et inde resurrecturum in gloriam, atque hos æternos esse dies quos multiplicandos sibi fidelis Dei cultor expectet. Ita enim et superius locutus est dicens. Et rursum circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum!*'

Section 6th includes the worship of fishes, reptiles, insects,

plants and stones. From the latter superstition is derived the doctrine of talismans. In section 7th, the motives which gave rise to the worship of animals are investigated: the conjectures of Plutarch and Diodorus, who fancied that animals were worshipped out of gratitude for the benefits which men derive from their use, and that of Lucian, who connected the veneration paid to animals with astrolatry, are considered, but the author endeavours to prove from some passages of Porphyry and other writers, that this practice was derived from the doctrine of emanation, and the incarnation of the superior beings in the forms of animals. He concludes with notices of several Egyptian Avatars very much according to the style of the celebrated fictions of the Hindoos. Section 8th, on the worship of men who received at Anabis divine honors, analagous to those paid to brutes, concludes with some remarks on the deification of the Egyptian kings, a practice derived from the same superstition. Section 9th, on the antiquity of the worship of animals in Egypt. The chapter concludes with a note, comparing the above-mentioned rites with the customs of the Hindoos, as connected with metaphysical ideas of a similar kind.

In the following chapter, the author describes the sacrifices and festivals of the Egyptians—the sacrifices of human victims—of swine—sheep—goats—the ceremonies relating to Typhon; the annual festivals: under each topic the statements left by the ancient writers are collected.

In the 3d chapter the civil institutions of this nation are analysed: the different classes into which the community was divided are described, and an account is given of the subdivisions of the sacerdotal class, and the religious duties, abstinences, &c. enjoined to them. These customs are in a note compared, and found remarkably to coincide with those of the Hindoos.

The last book concludes with a minute comparison of the ordinances of Moses, with the rites of his Egyptian instructors: of the mode in which this important subject is treated, we have not room to give our readers an adequate idea. Each topic is discussed singly: first, the theological doctrine of Moses is compared with that of the Egyptians—secondly, the political and civil institutions—thirdly, the ceremonies and ritual laws. The last section is on the origin of circumcision, and in this instance the opinion of Michaelis is adopted.

The critical examination of the remains of Egyptian chronology which is appended to the work on mythology, cannot at present be fully analysed. The object of the author is to determine whether the records of Egyptian chronology really assert

a claim to so vast a period of antiquity, as the tables compiled by Manethon and other writers seem at first sight to evince. It was long ago conjectured by Sir John Marsham, that several of the 30 dynasties were coeval, and not as it had been presumed, successive; this writer and his numerous followers have supposed that Egypt was divided into a number of petty states. Such an hypothesis, as the author of the present work contends, is contradictory to the general voice of history, sacred and profane, which ever represents Egypt as one kingdom, and speaks of the Pharaohs as monarchs of the whole realm; of which Thebes, at the era of the Trojan war, and subsequently Memphis, was the capital. Marsham has succeeded in bringing down the age of Menes, the founder of this monarchy, within the limits of the real age of the world, and of genuine history; but he has done it by violent means; he has cut the knot, instead of unloosing it.

The author of this work informs us in his preface, that he believes himself to have fallen by chance upon the clue by which this enigma is to be solved. He says, "In repeatedly examining the fragments of these chronicles, I thought I perceived some phænomena that explained the principle upon which they were originally constructed, and promised to connect the whole into one system. The more I investigated the matter, the more I became convinced that I was not deceived by fallacious coincidences. Of this, however, my readers will now judge. I shall only premise that, if I am correct, there is in reality no want of harmony between the historical records of the ancient Egyptians, and those contained in the sacred Scriptures.

The author's hypothesis is, that the tables of Memphite and Diopolitan kings were not different and coeval successions, but that they are in many instances different copies of the same identical series of kings, derived from the records of different temples, and with variations arising from the practice of giving several appellations to the same prince, or from the occasional insertion of the names of monarchs or provincial governors in the place of the hereditary sovereigns of all Egypt. The proofs of this position are to be found in the comparison of different tables with each other: we shall conclude by giving the reader a specimen that may enable him to form an idea of the kind of evidence adduced.

The three first dynasties of Memphite kings, which occur in Manethon's tables, happen to be preserved without any lacunæ. The whole period of time ascribed to these 3 dynasties is 691 years. On the author's supposition respecting the formation of these tables, it is probable that this is the Memphite re-

cord of the first seven centuries of the Egyptian monarchy. The names and reigns of these kings are accordingly set down in one column, and opposite to them are placed the kings of Diospolis from the laterculus of Eratosthenes, which are professedly taken from the temples of Thebes. Menes, the first king, is set down at the head of the column, and it terminates at the end of an equal portion of time with that occupied by the three Memphite dynasties. Here, the author considers the coincidences that display themselves to be sufficient to demonstrate the truth of his hypothesis.

Theban list of Eratosthenes.

Menes or Ménes
Athothes

Athothes 2

Diabies . . 19

Semphos or } 18
Som-phos }

Toigar } 85
St. Oichos }

Gosormies . 30*

Mares . . 26*

Anoyphes . . . 20

Siroes 18

Chnoubos Gneuvos } 50

Rauosis } 50

Bi-yris } 50

*Saophis . 29

*Saophis 2 . 37

*Mos-cheris . 21

2 kings reigned . 68

Apappos . . . 100

Acheacus O caras . 1

*Queen Nitocris . 6

Totals 687

First Memphite dynasties of Manethon.

Necherophis
Tosorthros or Æsculapius

Tyris

Mesochris

Soi-phs

{ Taser-tasis

{ Achis

30 Siphouris

26 Ker-pheres

29 Soris*

47 { Rhatoises } 2
Bicheres }

63 Souphis

66 Souphis 2

63 •Men-cheres

Ratoises

Bicheres

77 reigns of 5 kings

100 Phi-ops

• 1 Mente-Souphis

12 Queen Nitocris .

The coincidences here sufficiently speak for themselves. Some of the discrepancies are explained by the author, and in one or two instances, synchronisms are established by historical testimony where the tables give no evidence to this effect. In particular, it is proved by a collateral authority, that Tosorthros, or the Æsculapius of Memphis, was contemporary with the Thoth of Diopolis, who is, as the name appears to indicate, the Hathoth or Athothes of the tables.

The asterisks are meant to point out the more remarkable coincidences.

NOTICE OF
*ITINERARY OF EL HAGE BOUBEKER
 ANZANI, an African, from Seno-Palel in Senegal
 to Mekka, published at Fort Louis, Senegal, in 1820 ;
 and translated from the Arabic by M. P. ROUZEE.*

THIS Itinerary gives a description of a pilgrim's journey across Africa, from the French possessions on the western coast of Africa, to the Arabian gulf, performed in the years 1810, 1811, &c.

Europeans have no authentic intelligence respecting the districts situated between *Housa* and *Darfour*. Uncertain notices, collected in different places, have given place to various hypotheses respecting those countries, so that no part of the world is represented on our maps with such varying uncertainty as we perceive in the vague description of these countries.

Where Rennel places a merja¹ or morass, other geographers place a desert; some again substitute a chain of mountains, whilst others describe a lake or Mediterranean sea²: among all this uncertainty, although the Itinerary of Boubeker does not resolve all these doubts, yet his narrative contains, at least, the information that may lead to the most useful explications, as he crossed Africa from west to east, and passed through those countries that lie between *Housa* and *Darfour*.

¹ مرجه, merjah, is an Arabic word signifying a large sheet of water, lake, or morass; it is spelt by the French translators, as well as the word الحجاج, El Hage, with a *h*: but there is no *h* in either of the words, as will appear to any one who can read Arabic: moreover, the pronunciation has not the sound of *h*: there is no reason, therefore, why this word should be encumbered with a superfluous letter.

Boubeker is a Foulah by birth, and his family resides at Fouta-Toro; his communications with M. P. Rouzée, however, were in Arabic.

On his departure from his native town Fouta-Toro, he immediately proceeded to Ojaba, and from thence to the great town of Tjilogu, the capital of Fouta-Toro. After receiving the benedictions of the Almanys, he hastens to pass the frontiers of Fouta, and soon after reached the kingdom of Cagnoga, inhabited by the Sericoulis. He halted several weeks at Jawar, one of the principal towns of the country, then, passing gently through the province of Kasso, after about three months' absence since his departure from Seno-Palel, he reached Jarra, a considerable town, situated north-eastward of Jawar, the capital of the territory of Bagona. Jarra belonged formerly to the king of Karta, but it is now dependant on the Moors, and its population consists principally of merchants of that people. The trade here is considerable, particularly in salt, which is brought hither from the town of Tishet, near which are extensive salt mines.

His journey from Jarra to Sego exceeded a month's travelling. The country is covered with forests. It is peopled, but little cultivated. Sego, the capital of Bambarra, is situated to the east of Jarra, on both the banks of the Joliba. Bambarra is very fertile. The parts cultivated by the Foulahs are in general the most productive.

From Sego our traveller directed his steps towards Timbuctoo; and after travelling 27 days, reached that town. Timbuctoo is situated towards the north-east of Sego, at a short distance from Cailoum, a considerable river, which Boubeker thinks is a branch of the Joliba. Timbuctoo is as extensive and as populous as Sego, but much richer, having more trade. A considerable portion of the inhabitants are Moors; but the Twaricks are equally numerous, and sometimes superior to the Moors, in power and influence.

Boubeker intended to pass through the kingdom of Twart,¹ situated north-east of Timbuctoo, and proceed to Fezzan, to await the caravan of pilgrims from Barbary, which was about proceeding to Mekka through Egypt; but having no other subsistence on the road but the alms of pious Muselmén, he altered his plan after having contemplated the poverty of the Twaricks, and their indisposition to charity. The Twaricks are a Bedouween, and a warlike race, professing Islamism. Our traveller resolved, therefore, to return along by the banks of the Joliba,

¹ The name of the country inhabited by the Twaricks.

and arrived at Jinée the 10th day after quitting Timbuctoo. These two towns he considers as forming a part of Bambarra, and they are nearly in the same parallel of latitude.

A great trade is carried on at Jinée: the negroes are more numerous there than the Moors; but the latter have the jurisdiction and authority. From Jinée our pilgrim arrived in thirty days at Housa, which is a large town, situated two days' march from the Joliba. This journey was partly performed in a canoe on the river, and partly a-foot, passing through the countries of Kabi and Noufi.

The country known by the name of Housa comprehends five or six states. The Housians were formerly the only inhabitants, but at present the Foulahs and the Twariks possess, with the Moors, the greater part. The Foulahs occupy almost exclusively the western quarter, which is therefore called the Foulan. These Foulahs resemble in their color, physiognomy, and language, the inhabitants of Fouta-Toro. Among themselves they take the name of Dhomani. The Housians are black like the Joliffs, or the Seracoulis: they appear to understand but little of agriculture, or the rearing of sheep; whilst, according to Boubeker, the Foulahs are the best shepherds and the best laborers in the world. The Foulah country is the best cultivated of any he ever saw; and he therefore places it next to Egypt for richness and produce. The domestic animals are in greater abundance, and in better condition, than any where else. There are neither sugar canes, nor such a variety of fruits as in Egypt and in Syria. But wheat, barley, and two kinds of Indian corn, are produced in abundance: hemp and cotton also, with which they manufacture cloths, which they dye with the indigo of their country. They understand the art of dying in blue and in all other colors. The town of Housa has less commerce with Timbuctoo and Jinnie, than with the countries situated to the eastward. The sultan who resides at the town of Housa, is the most powerful of all the negro sovereigns in the western countries of Housa.

Our pilgrim proceeding from Housa eastward, was nearly a month travelling before he reached Kassinah, which is the most considerable town of the eastern part of Housa on the banks of the Joliba: it is fifteen or twenty times the size of St. Louis on the Senegal river. From Kassinah he proceeded to the town of Bournou, which he places exactly eastward of Kassina, the Joliba river passing through the whole country of which it is the capital. The natives of Bournou are as black as those of Housa,

* Query.—Is not the name itself a kind of corroboration of this opinion? It signifies in Arabic, a cultivator or farmer.

and resemble the latter in manners and customs, but they speak a different language, and are considered more courageous, as well as more intelligent. The sultan of Bournou is very powerful, and has a numerous cavalry.

From Bournou he proceeded to Wadaé (Waday), where he no longer observed on his right the river Joliba. He often inquired where that river terminated, and he was invariably informed that it communicated with the Nile. Its course according to some was southerly, and extending to the interior of Huheshah or Abyssinia.

Wadaé is watered by many rivers which join the Joliba. Boubeker crossed the country in the direction of south-east to north-east, and entered the territory of Begarnié. He soon after reached the great lake of Kouk, which receives a mighty stream from the south. The sultan of Kouk is often at war with the sovereigns of Begarnié and of Wadaé.

Nearly two months after his departure from Kassinal, he reached the mountains of Four; but he remarked no great town between these mountains and Bournou.

From the Four country he passed on eastward to the country of Kordofan,¹ inhabited exclusively by Arabs. After proceeding along the banks of the river two or three days, he crossed it opposite to Tjondi, a considerable town, from whence he entered the Barbars country, where he found the inhabitants occupied in agricultural pursuits, who resembled in physiognomy and complexion the Foulahs. From Tjondi he arrived in fifteen days at Suakim on the Arabian Gulf, and from thence he embarked for Jidda, the port of Mekka; having thus journeyed during fourteen months or thereabout, since his departure from Seno-Palel in Senegal.

Our pilgrim, after performing his devotions at Mekka, went to Medina, and from thence to Jerusalem, St. Jean d'Acre, Cairo and Alexandria. In this last town he remained a long time, and then embarked for Algiers, where he remained several years, after which he again returned to Fouta-Tora by the Marocco caravan, passing through Telemsen, Fas, Mequines, Marocco, Wadinoon, and the Sahara. From his long residence in Egypt, and on the coast of Barbary, at Alexandria and at Algiers, he had forgotten many particulars, which, although uninteresting to himself, would have been important to Europe.

This interesting Itinerary is followed by some apt observations of M. Rouzée, who thinks Cagnana, a kingdom so named by Boubeker, the same with the Gayaga of Labat, and the Kaiaaka of Mungo Park. Djarri is the town called by Delislo, Jara, and

by Mungo Park, Farra. These little differences will necessarily continue in the progress of our discovery of Africa, until the Arabic language shall become more generally known. The Moors, M. Rouzée observes, scarcely know the name of Farra, but call it Bagnall, which is the name of the country of which it is the capital. Some Arab sheiks spoke to the translator of this paper from the Arabic, of a town named Tedjagja, which is near to Waden, or Haden according to the maps, where a great commerce is carried on in salt. The translator thinks this place is identified with Tagazza.¹

The position of the kingdom of Bournou, as Boubeker has described it, agrees exactly with Hermeunus account. The great river which runs from the south into the lake Kouk, appears to M. Rouzée to be the Misseled of Brown. The mountainous country of Four is unquestionably *Dar Foor*.² Tjondi is the Shandi of the maps. The Arabian writers mention a country called Barbara, inhabited by a race of a reddish-black color.³

Our Senegal translator heard the traveller mention the name of Wancarah, which is unquestionably Wangara. Boubeker places the country south of Bournou, and describes it as being overflowed by the Joliba, as Egypt is by the Nile, and that gold abounds there.⁴ He had heard of Kano and Guebur (Cano and Guber), but he did not recollect their position.* He says Takzour in several of the negro languages, signifies the same with the Arabic word Sudan, i. e. Nigritia.

Translated from the French by

JAMES GREY JACKSON.

¹ This is likely enough, because the latter word is spelt with the Arabic guttural letter grain, (ع) which partakes of the English ع and ا, but can hardly be pronounced by an European throat.

² For a dissertation on the Arabic word *Dar*, vide Classical Journal, No XLIX. p. 149.

³ We suspect these to be the Berebers, originally of the Atlas. Their dark color does not weaken this opinion: the same race of men living in mountains, and afterwards coming down to inhabit the plains, soon become several shades darker, as I have myself perceived in the mountains of south Atlas. Also by exposure to the sun and air of the plains. I recollect having an interview with Muley Soliman, the present emperor of Morocco, at Mogador, before he became emperor, when he was as white as a native of southern Europe. He is now almost black, or rather was so, when I had my last audience of the sultan; that is to say, about 16 or 18 years ago. They may also be the Brabeesh, who are Arabs occupying the country north of Timbuctoo, as also east of Cairo in the Nubian desert, between the Oasis and that city; for which see the map alluded to in the following note.

⁴ See the situation of this place in the map of the caravans in Jackson's account of Morocco.

NOTICE OF
IDYLLIA HEROICA ¹*DECEM, Librum Pha-*
leuciorum Unum, partim jam primo partim iterum
atque tertio edit SAVAGIUS LANDOR. *Accedit Quæs-*
tiuncula cur poetæ Latini recentiores minus legantur.
Pisis, apud S. Nistrum MDCCCXX.

'Ἄλλ' ἰφομαρτεῖτον καὶ σπεύδεται ὅττι τάχιστα
 Ταῦτα δ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς τεχνήσομαι ἥδ' ἐ νόησω
 Στεινωπῇ ἐν ὁδῷ παραδύμεναι, οὐδέ με λήσει.'

THIS is in all respects an extraordinary publication. A volume of Latin compositions, by an Englishman of the nineteenth century, is of itself a phenomenon. The character of the pieces themselves, too, is heterogeneous; exhibiting, amidst numberless inaccuracies of phrasology and violations of costume, a classical spirit, and an acquaintance with the true genius of Latin poetry, such as has rarely been equalled, especially in these modern times. To complete the anomaly, the work is published, not in the author's native country, but in a foreign land, from motives which will hereafter be explained in a quotation from his Latin essay.

Of Mr. Landor himself our knowledge is principally derived from his writings; from these we gather that he is a man of an original and somewhat eccentric turn of mind, independent in his opinions on all subjects, and free in his declaration of them. As a writer, his characteristics are vigor of fancy, acuteness, and nicety of taste; with which he joins a share of classical scholarship greater than has fallen to the lot of English poets in general, since the time of Gray. Like Gray, he has cultivated Latin poetry and that of his own language with equal zeal, and almost equal success. We call him an English poet, although of those now existing he is the least known: were we, however, from our partial acquaintance with his works, to assign him a place among the highest, we have reason to believe that we should

¹ Il. v. 414. Mr. Landor has not given the passage accurately. *Ἄλλ' ἐν στεινωπῇ and παραδύμεναι.*

not be alone in our opinion. His first publication, of which we have any knowledge, was an epic poem, intitled *Gebir*,¹ founded on a modern romantic story; published first in Latin, and afterwards in English. With the English poem only are we acquainted; it is uninteresting as a whole, from causes into which this is not the place to enquire; its merits consist in the classical stateliness of its manner, and in the power of imagination and vividness of description which characterise detached passages. We were particularly struck with the episode of the shepherd Tamar, and the descent of Gebir to the infernal regions: it is no mean praise to have treated a hackneyed topic, like the latter, at once well and originally. It is evident that the writer had Milton before his view in this work; it exhibits throughout, on a small scale, the same chastised dignity of style, the same elaborate harmony, and the same rich and studied condensation of thought: his excessive desire of brevity, however, frequently betrayed him into harshness and obscurity—the latter a besetting fault of our author's, as we shall hereafter have occasion to notice. Of "*Chrysaor*," a poem founded on the mythology of the Titans, we know nothing. Mr. Landor is likewise the reputed author of *Count Julian*, a tragedy, on a subject of which other portions have been treated by Southey and Walter Scott, and in which, if we may form a judgment from an imperfect perusal, coupled with the opinions of better critics than ourselves, he showed himself fully adequate to compete with those masters. In this, as in all his works, his predilection for antiquity is visible: the diction and versification of *Count Julian* is rather that of a Virgilian and Miltonian epic, than of an English tragedy.

It is as a Latin poet, however, that we are now to consider him. Of his productions in this language, some, we believe, exist only in private circulation; others (among the rest several of those before us) have been, as the title-page informs us, already published; the present collection, however, is the first which has offered itself to our critical notice, and of this we shall proceed to give an account. Should our extracts be more numerous than usual, the singularity of the work itself, as well as its intrinsic excellence, must plead our vindication.

¹ To Mr. Landor, as the author of *Gebir*, the *Curse of Kehama* was dedicated by Dr. Southey; to whom a community of opinions and pursuits in early life seems to have attached our author, and whom he never mentions without expressions of affectionate admiration.

The Latin preface to the "*Idyllia Heroica*" exhibits a specimen of the negligences so frequent in this volume.

Idyllium, ut quibusdam videtur, heroica esse non potest. Veteres alia fuisse sententia versus quo unico scribitur declarat. Talia sunt Theocriti quædam, ejusdemque esset generis Catullianum illud de nuptiis Pelei et Thetidis, nisi pepli descriptio *intercedisset*; ea non tantum *episodia* est sed pars major ut et melior poematis. Ex Ovidio exciperemus plurima. Si rationem hanc operis normamque conservare, si suis actionem quamque finibus concludere, nec perpetuam prodigiorum seriem deducere *malluisset*, locum profecto minus opportunum habuisset suavissimus poeta verborum abundantia.

Et olim nostra forsitan ob id saltem legi possint, quod, cum omnes omnium sæculorum qui poemata latina scripserunt, aliena scripserint, neminem nisi semel, idque versibus tantum quaternis, imitemur.

We shall not stop to examine the correctness of this opinion, but shall proceed, without further delay, to the poems in which the author has exemplified his theory.

The most striking feature in Mr. Landor's Latin poetry is its originality. He has more of the air of a genuine ancient than any writer we are acquainted with. His style is that of Latin poetry in the abstract, and not that of any individual Latin poet. He has not copied the manner of Lucretius, or Catullus, or Ovid, or Virgil, or Horace; but he has transfused into his own compositions the character and spirit common to all, and by which they were distinguished from the poets of other countries. This is the true method of imitating the ancients; not to borrow the words of a classical writer as vehicles for our own thoughts, but to write as much as possible, in the same manner as we ourselves should have done, had we been ancients. This is indeed high praise; and its value may be estimated by its rarity. It is, however, subject, in the present case, to considerable deductions. In the first place, Mr. Landor's phraseology is far from being sufficiently accurate, especially in his heroics. He exhibits, indeed, as we have before intimated, a singular compound of classical taste and feeling with careless, or at least incorrect, diction. In this respect, as in all others, he is the very reverse of Casimir. Casimir's style is, if we may so express ourselves, elegantly inelegant. His thoughts are unclassical, but they are classically expressed; his materials are rich, but ill arranged; all the parts are good, but the effect of the whole is rather showy than pleasing; there is abundance of good things, but they are scattered about with a slovenly and tasteless profusion, like that of the barbarian feasts described by Aristophanes. Mr. Landor, on the contrary, is elegant in the aggregate, but inelegant in many of the particulars.

This defect is more conspicuous in his prose than in his poetry, and in his heroics than his hendecasyllabics. The latter, too, are comparatively free from certain other faults which are observable in his Idyls ; an occasional obscurity, less visible indeed in these than in his earlier productions ; and a certain harshness and brokenness of manner, very unlike the round and compact style of ancient Roman poetry. His poems are deficient in continuity ; they want a pervading and vivifying spirit ; their excellences lie too much in parts, in delicate touches, and insulated thoughts and descriptions ; they are unformed masses, which want only the magic touch of a combining power to make them start into systems of life and beauty ; there is much more of minute felicity than of general effect. We are disposed to attribute these faults in some measure to the peculiarity of the author's disposition. Throughout his writings there is visible a determination to judge for himself, and a lofty contempt for the cavils of narrow-minded critics. We do not blame him for his independence ; it is a proper, and, in these days of critical invective and abuse, a necessary quality ; but there is a difference between the spirit of independence and the spirit of defiance. It is possible for a man to put too much, as well as too little, confidence in himself. Mr. Landor's muse, like the indulged part of her sex, likes to have her own way. She will

————— for no man's pleasure
Change a syllable or measure.

He has too much the air of an English gentleman writing at his ease. In his disdain of the arts by which others obtain transitory popularity, he is not sufficiently studious of the legitimate means of acquiring the good opinion of the well-judging. This will at least account for much of the hardness of manner, and perplexity of expression, which occur in these poems, and which a little care, properly directed, might apparently have removed ; as well as for some occasional irrelevancies and whimsical excrescences, of which the most extraordinary instance is in the tenth Idyl, where, in the very critical point of the poem, the writer suddenly starts off into a digression, containing as many enigmas as lines, relative to certain modern swindlers, whose exploits are in some inexplicable way connected with the subject of the poem. From these, and from some other causes, Mr. Landor frequently stands in as much need of a commentator as the classics themselves.

With all his skill, too, he has not been able to avoid occasional anachronisms in point of sentiment and manners; and in the disposition of his incidents, as well as in his manner of relating them, a modern air is sometimes visible. It is hardly practicable, indeed, for a modern, writing in imitation of the ancients, to avoid occasionally betraying the secret of his age by some slips of this kind. To these faults must be added a grossness, which, however it might be pardoned in an ancient writer, is inexcusable in the countryman of Milton, and the friend and admirer of Southey. It is but justice to Mr. Landor to observe that this is but an occasional deformity, and not the general character of his poems. Of its muse we hope it may be said, as of the convert of old—"Peregrinatus est in nequitia, non habitavit." We shall hereafter have occasion to quote from him an energetic passage relative to the union between poetry and good morals.

His versification is as original and peculiar as his style, and resembles it in character. It is chaste, and free from the tameness chargeable on modern Latin versifiers, but deficient in flow, and sometimes rugged. We do not think he is monotonous; at least, if he is so, his monotony does not resemble that of any other writer. But he wants compass; there is no sufficient extent or flexibility in his harmony; nothing Virgilian—no

—————winding bout

Of linked sweetness long drawn out.

In his rhythm, as in other respects, if there is any writer whom he resembles more than others, we think it is Ovid. He is not over-correct in his quantity; is this owing to a want of that regular and long-continued practice, which is almost as necessary as the frequent perusal of the classics, for the attainment of correctness in these minute points? The Latin versifiers of the sixteenth century wrote no poetry but Latin; the idea of employing their vernacular idiom on such subjects never at all occurred to them; their faculty of Latin versification was therefore kept in constant exercise, and acquired ease and correctness by practice. But all this is mere speculation. We shall conclude our preliminary observations, which will perhaps be thought somewhat too protracted considering the extensive field we have to traverse, with a passage from Mr. Landor's "*Quæstiuncula*," containing a character of the Latin poetry of the Jesuit Des Bussières,

in which he has partially anticipated our remarks on his own performances.—“*Sutheius noster, in annotationibus ad Rodericum, e Bussierio descriptionem laudavit. Suavis est illa, nec indigna quæ summo poetæ ac peritissimo judici placeat, vellem tantummodo pleniorum spiritum duce-ret Bussierius, nec membra sententiarum frangeret.*” p. 250.

The subjects of these Idyls are without exception taken from ancient fable or mythology. We consider the choice judicious. Modern subjects can be treated with propriety only in Latin verse, where they involve none of the differences in opinion, or custom, or feeling, between the modern and the ancient world; but in narrative poetry this is impracticable. We do not deny that there is a beauty of a peculiar kind in the combination of ancient language with modern thoughts, and the treating of modern subjects in an ancient manner; but this is not the beauty of classical poetry; it is the result of contrast, not of conformity.

The first Idyl is intitled “*Cupido et Pan* ;” the subject is a half-sportive contest between the two deities, terminating of course in the victory of the former. We shall give the greater part of it, without any comment, as a specimen of Mr. Landor's general style and versification.

Porrectum somno deprndit Pana Cupido,
Eripuit pellem, tegeret qua membra, caprinam,
Atque hinc incurvos atque illinc corpore villos
Vellit, at ille rubro proflavit pectore curam
De grege, de nivibus, tantum alto in monte relictis,
Nec sensit magis ac perstricto cortice suber.
Sub collo jacuit dilecta cicuta reclini,
Hanc puer amovit neque senserat Arcas, at aurem
Furtivo attactu leviter tremefecit acutam.
“Jupiter! an quisquam tranquillior Arcade divum,”
Clamat Amor, “conjux nihil hunc tua voce moveret.”
Deinde labris subdit roseis inflatque cicutam
Acior: e foliis geminas sonus excitat aures,
Infremit et saltu terram quatit: altior alis
Exilit increpitatque puer ridetque minacem.
“Pone tuos arcus, Amor improbe, pone sagittas,
Et quid ages?”

“Quid agam, Pan, experiere; jacebunt.”

Dixit, et arcus humi sonat et salit aureus ictu,
Et pharetra occulitur nascentibus ilicet herbis.
“Sed pudet”...

“Haud pudeat mecum contendere quemquam,
Haud etiam vinci, considerit ira, pigebit:
Tu, pudibunde, manus jam consere, conseret hostis.”
Volvebat flavos oculos deus, atque repente

Captabat, veluti volucrem si retia claudant
 Ignorantem et metuat formosas perdere pennas,
 Brachiolum, propius quum illudere cœpit, Amori.
 Purpureum puero faciem liquisse colorem
 Nunc primum, et subita tanquam nive, tempore verno,
 In medio tactam lusu disci-ve trochi ve,
 Contremuisse ferunt et correpsisse fugaci.
 "I, puer" Arcas ait "majores disce vereri,
 Et procul; impubis preme verba minacia formæ;
 Qui mecum certare audes urgesque quietum
 Ter quinos aliquis, ni sis deus, abnuat annos
 Exigere. . i, salicisque time sub vimine pœnam."
 His puer exardet, stimulant pudor iraque, dictis,
 Erigitur, validumque intentat sævior ictum
 Pectus ubi hirsutum, capreæ sine pelle, patebat,
 Orior aut aquila aut quod detulit illa Tonanti
 Fulmine: vitavit venientem providus Arcas
 Corripuitque manum; manus arsit ut ignis in ara.
 Abstinit subito senior, buccæque rotundæ
 Subtili afflaviv patulam spiramine dextram,
 Tum petit amplexu et constringere lubrica certat
 Colla sinumque dei, tremit inextexere curvo
 Crure femur teneramque ungui subvertere plantam,
 Et premit aptatis cedentia marmora palmis.

The second Idyl, "Pudoris Ara," describes the carrying away of Helen by Theseus, and the marriage of Penelope, as related by Pausanias (III.); two subjects, between which it is difficult to discover any connexion, except that of time, according to Plutarch as referred to by our author; which nevertheless are here united in one story. The first part, the rape of Helen, is one of those pieces of gratuitous indecency of which we have formerly spoken as disgracing this volume: all that can be said in palliation of this, as of our author's other impurities, is that they are coarse, open and palpable, like Falstaff's lies; undisguised by any sentimental drapery, and "made easy to the meanest capacity." Of the two, we prefer downright, honest, unsophisticated grossness. The story of Penelope, however, is sweetly told: we extract part of the narrative.

Audiit hæc, et lora manu laxatâ repressit
 Dulichius; recipit mitissima nata gementem,
 Dumque senis lævo complexa est colla lacerto
 Frigida rugosas mulgebant oscula malas.
 Hunc interpellat juvenis, "Me Sparta domusque
 Penelopes retinere diu natalis amantem
 Et merito potuere, sed est pater, est mihi tellus,
 Est populus, neque neglecti sine crimine divi."
 "Si pius es," pater inclinat, "mihi cede volentem.
 Eligat ille refert: audito pallida vultum
 Penelope defigit humi, sed dextera vestem
 Arcta viri tenet et singultu pectora surgunt.

'Elige,' ait genitor, 'caræ reminiscere matris
 Et miseresce mei!' torquentur corda silenti
 Dum jubet, æternum tamen haud invita sileret.
 'Quin loqueris, mea Penelope, vis?' inquit Ulysses.
 Avertens liquit patris in cervice lacertum,
 Obductoque tegens humentia lumina velo
 Debile cum gemitu collum inclinavit amanti.

The next poem, intitled "*Sponsalia Polyxenæ*," is in our opinion the least happy of the whole; the incidents are ill digested and ill told, and the general effect singularly unsatisfactory. The dying speech of Achilles, with which it concludes, and of which we extract a part, contains some examples of the author's proneness to slide into Anglicisms.

Ponite . . vos jubeo . . nemo mortalis Achillem
 Audeat ulcisci, nisi sanguine cretus eodem
 Et patre dignus, avoque domi! celerate regressum,
 Alcime et Automedon, taciti secludite castris,
 Ne cernant, metuantque parum nil triste jubentem,
 Myrmidones . . Ajax, Tydide, linquite corpus
 Exanime, et minimis vivorum animalibus impar . .
 Quid loquor! auferte . . haud videat quo gaudeat hostis!
 Et Trojana meum carpent armenta sepulcrum!
 Ne pius incassum stillet cervicebus humor,
 Quisquis es a dextra! rigido stant lumina ferro
 Optatusque negant extremum agnoscere vultus . .
 Fata vocant . . humeris imbellia brachia quæso
 Exuite! ingenti vos pondere meque fatigant,
 Sæva languoris pendentia tabe peresa.

Deficio . . voces-ne meas auditis, an ægro
 Omnia conatu expirant meque ipse scelli?
 Haud memini, jam tanta animi caligine mersor,
 Quæ jussa ediderim, quæ vota indicta relinquam,
 Attamen hæc absint vobis obliviam nostri,
 Et, quanquam occulto sub vulnere distrahit oculus,
 Primorum accipiar timearque recentibus umbris.

"Dryope" is a tale of celestial scandal, related in our author's broad manner, ἀξέστοις ἔπεισι καὶ ἀκαλλωπίστοις; we shall therefore be pardoned if we abstain from making any quotations, and pass on to the fifth Idyl, "*Corythus*," one of the author's best performances, though marked in parts with his besetting faults of flatness and obscurity. It is the story of Corythus, the son of Paris and CEnone, who on arriving at manhood was sent to Troy by his mother, where the favorable reception given him by Helen excited the jealousy of Paris, by whom he was slain before he had an opportunity of making himself known. To this cause the poet attributes the inflexibility of CEnone, when her assistance was afterwards solicited by Paris in the cure of

his wound. We would extract the soliloquy of Œnone on Corythus's departure, but our limits forbid. The introduction of Corythus to Helen is well managed. The latter appears here invested with the same graceful majesty as in Homer.

ORIENTAL CRITICISM.

IN the notices of Oriental Literature in your Classical Journal, 48., having observed a party *statement* of a literary dispute between me and another anonymous writer, under the signature of Munsif, in the *Asiatic Register and Journal*, I beg leave to draw your attention to the other side of the question; and trust to your *impartiality* and *candor* for inserting what I now have to say, in your next number.

I passed the best part of my life in the East-India Company's Bengal establishment, and have for some years lived retired at a distant provincial capital in England, with the competent means of a gentleman; and having made the Oriental languages there my study, find in them here that recreation, which many of your learned readers at Oxford and Cambridge, Edinburgh or Dublin, do in Greek and Latin: and having, during the last six years, *gratuitously* indulged the public with lucubrations in Persian and Arabic Anthology every alternate month, in the *Asiatic Journal*, I could not, of course, help animadverting upon various and often questionable topics; and though on my own part I rather courted *liberal criticism*, and was occasionally *threatened* by the Haylebury-college Professors, I might have *quietly* proceeded, had I not *incidentally* more than *intentionally* touched upon the tender craft of book-making!

And this was the occasion: Professor S., as you notice, had published a translation of the 7th chapter of the *Anwārī Sohailī*, or Persian text of Bidpai or Pilpai's fables; a work which, next to the Bible with the Jews, the Gospel with Christians, and the Coran with Mohammedans, is highly prized throughout the East. Having had the loan of a copy of it for a few hours from a friend, I was so pleased with it, as to pledge

myself in the A. J. of June to bring it into notice by a *favorable* review of it; but on a closer view, and putting it to the test afterwards of a comparison with the Persian text, I found I could not *honestly* praise it; and though so far committed, yet having no wish to wound the translator's feelings, I abstained from exposing his mistakes to a greater degree, than a just regard for *truth*, and the duty I owed the public, as a literary critic, required of me; and confining my *lenient remarks* to the *first* and *last* sentence of it, volunteered a translation of my own to supply its object and place. This appeared in the Asiatic Journal of October.

In the A. J. of November the translator answers me; and seems at first, as he expresses it, inclined "to let the public decide on its merits:" and had he maintained this *prudent resolution*, he and I would have been of one mind, and parted good friends. But he unfortunately adds, "the attempt of Gulchīn appears very little calculated to recommend literal translations; its numerous errors and inaccuracies relieve me from all anxiety as to the effects of his censure." Here he concludes, without specifying what those *errors* and *inaccuracies* are: like a junior counsel, he thus contents himself with reading his brief, and cunningly, he thinks, manages to let his cause be opened, and his case detailed, by a leading counsel, and his evil spirit, Mun-sif. This the latter attempts in the Journal of November, not by justifying the mistaken translation of the Professor, but by recriminating on Gulchīn; as a specimen of which I may quote the Persian compound substantive *ابر بحاری* *Abar-bahārī*, which "Gulchīn," he says, "renders a *spring* cloud—it should be a *vernal* cloud!" and two thirds of the 18 errors, which he thus specifies, are of a like hypercritical, trifling, and quibbling stamp! But the other six are of a more serious complexion, not as bearing against Gulchīn, but as forcing upon me *glaring examples*, and what in *mercy* to the translator I had *myself* avoided, of the *grossest blundering* of himself in *false grammar*, and of his *assistant* in *incorrect rhyme, quantity and ascent*!

But to prevent any misconception of my motives in these remarks, let me in justification of myself premise, that I consider the East-India Directors as the most liberal corporation in England, and the *establishment* of their colleges at Hayleybury and Addiscombe, as well as the mother-college at Calcutta, as *an honor* to the *British nation*. Nor can I ever bring myself to speak or think ill of the College Professors as a learned body; but when individuals of them submit to become book-makers

and pseudo-critics, they become in their turn the subject of fair criticism.

To follow Munsif through all his windings, and bring his own and party's blunders into entire view, would require a constant reference to the Persian text and type; and therefore in order to prove my assertions, *we* must be content with two examples in Persian, and one in Arabic; but as they are strong and full in point, and as I shall accompany them with an analysis and *ordo verborum*, a process I find *Munsif* flies from, or *silently* passes over, I can have no doubt of convincing your learned readers of the ignorance of this pretender to *Oriental Literature*.

My first example is a clause of the first sentence of the 7th chapter of the *Anwāri Sohaili*; and, as indeed it first struck me, it is an instance of the inadequateness of the Professor's translation for the purpose which he intended, and his own incapacity for the task. In the Persian characters it runs thus: تا بسلامت بجزر چکوف قدم ودين کار خر; the *literal* translation of which is; "that he may, through any manner of exertion, put forward his foot in this business with safety;" the analysis and *ordo verborum* running thus: تا *in order that*, ب *through*, چکوف *any, or any sort of*, بجزر *exertion*, خر *he may put forward, or plant*, قدم *the foot*, در *in*, دين *(the contraction of ايني) this, business*, ب *with*, سلامت *safety*: and no young gentleman of a month's standing in the first term at his college could find any difficulty in construing this: yet Professor S. divides it into two clauses; and Munsif repeats this division, and makes them thus separately the 11th and 12th articles of my imputed 18 errors! The first of these two clauses the Professor translates, "*in order to effect his liberation*:" and his assistant Munsif, after a month's deliberate consultation and study, alters it a little, but does not mend it, by re-echoing it as a charge against me in these words: "*so that he may escape in safety*;" both of them thus converting the substantive noun *jah'd*, signifying *effort*, into the third person singular of the aorist of the verb *jahidani*, signifying to *leap, spring, gallop, trot*; but admitting it were otherwise right, in no sense implying, to *effect liberation or escape*!

This is not, however, the worst part of it; the *second* of his two clauses the Professor translates, "*say, how shall he attempt this?*" thus giving the adjective noun چکوف, signifying *any*, and which in this sense should agree with its substantive, *jah'd*;

effort, the combined signification of a *verb* and an *interrogative pronoun* in the two words of his translation, “say, how?” And this assistant *Munsif*, in order again to make it a more plausible article of *recrimination* upon me, suppresses the *verb* “say,” and retains only the *interrogative pronoun* “how,” making it “how shall he attempt this?” Moreover, both have rendered this *second clause* into their *English translations*, for which they have no *authority* in the *Persian text*. As he had done in two or three other instances of his own detected blunders, *Munsif* would have called this an *oversight*, had he not, in his anxiety of imputing it as another of my 18 errors, made too *deliberate* an act of it, to get thus rid of it: yet with the same assurance, and although he has had my analysis and *ordo verborum* twice laid before him, in his rejoinder in the *Asiatic Journal* of February, he again calls on me to explain it—which, by the bye, I had done; and the party having my answer submitted to them in *Ms.*, on finding it *unanswerable*, had the power of *suppressing* it!!!

In the *Classical Journal*, No. 48, Mr. Editor, *Munsif* says that, “in the small space of *ten lines* he has detected *no less* than 18 of *Gulchîn’s* errors;” and I now reply, that I thus dispose of *two* of the *ten lines*, and of *three* of his *six errores maximi*, and return them upon him and his party with interest; and it is only want of room, and having *blunders* of still greater magnitude to animadvert on, that prevent my re-assigning the whole batch to them.

My next example is a tetrastic of Persian poetry; and as it contains a series of the Professor’s and *Munsif’s* blunders, I shall have occasion to refer to it repeatedly, and must accordingly

quote it entire in the Persian text: مرد ثابت قدم انست که از

جانرود ورچہ ز کشت بود کرد زمین چو فلک* مثل سیمرغ

کطوفان نبرد از جایش* دچو کنی شک که اقتر بدم از باد تفک

which Professor S. translates, “A man of resolution is he who will not deviate from his purpose, although compelled to wander round the world like the heavens: like the *phoenix* he remains unmoved in the midst of storm, not like the sparrow, who falls by the wind of a pop-gun.” And let me in the first place contrast this, as I fairly did the whole chapter, with my own translation: “Were the globe of this earth to whirl about, (or be turned upside down,) like the sky, the man firm to his purpose would not

budge from his place; like the *Simorgh* in mount Cāf (our Caucasus), whom a hurricane cannot move from its place, and not like a *wren*, which *will fall* 'from the puff of a pop-gun (or rather pea-puffer and *blower*).'" This fabulous bird, whose name is composed of *sī*, thirty, and *morgh*, birds, and hence referred to here, on account of its *bulk* and not *melody*, is not the phoenix, which the Persian dictionaries very accurately describe under the word ققنوس *cacnūs*, its *Rūmī*, as they call it, or *Greek* name; but a rational bird destined to reside on mount Cāf throughout all the fourteen revolutions of this world; and which Firdōsī makes the patron of his hero Rostam and the father Zāl; and is no doubt the origin of our Griffin, of heraldic notoriety.

This, and many thousands of *pure* Persian words besides, I engage fully to explain from *real Oriental* documents, in my projected Persian Dictionary, on which I have been occupied above twenty years; and I might have had it long ago in the press, had there not been that *college cubal*, which I have all along suspected; and which Munsif, in his last rejoinder in the Asiatic Journal of February, now *barefacedly* tells me is ready to oppose me. At a long distance from an Oriental press, and aware of the hostility of a junto which I have reason to believe is averse from all improvement in Oriental literature, and whose chief not only was, I suspect, the cause of garbling a critique on the Burhānī Cātai, also a Dictionary of pure Persian, published lately at Calcutta, but of putting a stop to the Annals of Oriental Literature, the periodical work in Part 11. of which one half, and that so garbled, of this critique appeared, a solitary laborer like myself reaches that conclusion of a huge literary work, after much previous and additional preparation. Nevertheless despising such petty and malignant interventions, though this *avowed opposition* places me again in a *prudential state of further preparation*, I never meant to court such men's favor, had I needed it: still less as I can apply at once to the Honorable Court of East-India Directors, who with their wonted liberality will no doubt step between me (which is all I require of them) and *any loss* in so *necessary, expensive, and patriotic an undertaking*; and if I should desire to secure its copy-right, it would be rather with the view of preventing any such *professed book-makers*, than of enabling myself to benefit from it.

I have not been accustomed to speak of myself; and, after this necessarily personal digression, make my apology; and beg

leave to return to the Persian tetrastic, where the Professor in his translation converts کرد *gard*, a substantive noun, signifying *a body, the globe, &c.* and the nominative of this chief verb in the first distich of it, into *gard*, a preposition, signifying *about, round*; and instead of it makes مرد *mard*, signifying *a man*, the nominative of this verb; and gives this verb in its compound tense, namely کشت بود *kash bud*, signifying, "*it were turned upside down*," the signification of "*compelled to wander*!"—thus absurdly setting his resolute man a wandering round the world like the heavens; and then comparing him to the phoenix, as remaining unmoved in the midst of storms! whereas nothing can more strongly express *steadiness and firmness*, than the two words of the Persian text, namely *gard-i-zamīn*, or the *body of the earth*, which, according to the Ptolemaic scheme of astronomy, the modern Persians consider as the center of our planetary system; an opinion which their Saracen conquerors forced upon them with the Mohammedan religion; for the ancient Pārsēs recognised the sun as such, long before Pythagoras or Copernicus thought of him. This series of grammatical blunders Munsif not only sanctions, by making them also an article of recrimination upon Gulchīn, but he must add to them by deliberately taking, from the margin of some Persian Mss. of the text, the

word تنگ *tofang*, a provincial barbarism, where it had been written to explain the proper word *tofaḳ*; and in this farther instance of his ignorance offers *tofang* as a rhyme with *falak*!

Convicted of such transgressions against all the rules of speaking and writing the Persian language correctly, the most hardened sinner would be expected to shrink from the counter: but not so Munsif; for, making light of these charges, he rallies with a new subject; and in his rejoinder in the Asiatic Journal of February, gives me an opportunity of proving him as ignorant of *prosody*, as he is of *rhyme and grammar*. For this purpose I must refer the reader to the fourth hemistich of the tetrastic, on which I had observed in my reply of January,—“that all our copies had

omitted the preposition از *az*, signifying *from*, and so necessary to the measure, as well as to the sense.”—To this Munsif in his February rejoinder replies, that *āz* is *not necessary*; for the word دم *dom*, in its omission, becomes the governing noun, and must consequently have the *izāfat*, or sign of the genitive case, after it; which is as much as to say, that this example of *classical Persian poetry*, quoted in the *Anwārī Sohailī* from Ibn

Yamin, a poet of the first rank, and which unlike the *Greek* and *Latin*, and all our *languages* of *Europe* ancient or modern, has nothing *anomalous* in its *quantity* and *accent*, or *uncertain* in its *rhyme*, could admit of the *short syllable* of an *izāfat*, to sup-

ply the place of the *long syllable* از āz ! Indeed so precise in this respect is Persian poetry, that it is not in quantity and accent alone, but every moveable and quiescent letter in one line of it, must have a corresponding moveable and quiescent letter in the

next; accordingly the corresponding از āz of the first line, the حم ham of the second, and the ر rad of the third of this tetras-
tic, are all *long syllables*; and each of the four consists of two represented letters, the first being moveable and the last quiescent: and it is hence another singular advantage of Persian poetry, that the *eye* is as good a guide as the *ear* in detecting false measures: and it is the same with its rhymes in the converse, which must not only sound *correct* to the *ear*, but also *appear* so to the *eye*.

It remains for me to give the ordo verborum of the first distich, as follows: آنست or demonstrative pronoun آن prefixed to ست, the contraction of است, and both together signifying—that is, مرد mardi, a man, ثابت قدم of a firm step, ک kih, who, نرود or the third person singular of the aorist of raftan, to go, with the negative نه nah prefixed to it, and signifying—will not go, از az, from, جا jā, the place: وچ notwithstanding, کرد زمین gardi zamīn,—the globe of the earth: سر کشت بود a compound phrase signifying سر sar, the head, and کشت بود might be whirled round, or were its head turned upside down, ح چو like, فلک the sky:

— si fractus illabatur orbis,
Impavidum ferient ruinæ.

So regular and simple as it is in its rules of grammar, and consequently so easy of acquisition, and abounding with beautiful specimens of ingenious and classical works in prose as well as verse; and being the sole government language of business, to which it is superiorly adapted, in all the departments of our

great Eastern empire, it has often surprised me, that the study of the *Persian language* has not been more cultivated by our learned men of Oxford and Cambridge. For my part, I have volunteered my frequent services as a *gratuitous* tutor, and have lately had several young gentlemen, previous to their entrance at Hayleybury and Addiscombe colleges, to take lessons in it; and have, in the course of *six or seven mornings*, instructed them to *write, read, translate, and parse* three or four apologues and stories from the Gulistan! During the last two centuries Oxford and Cambridge have abounded with *superior* scholars in Arabic, and I have often read and compared, with pleasure and satisfaction, the translations of a Richardson and Carlisle; consequently it would be paying them a poor compliment to enter so much into detail of my examples from that dialect.

The first example of a pure Arabic clause, which occurs in Professor Stewart's translation of the 7th chapter of the Anwārī Sohailī, is too easy for any Tyro to mistake it; therefore I shall proceed with the second; which is as follows:

والله افوض امري الى الله and which the Professor has translated:—“*Consign (thou) the affair to the Almighty:*”—and has thus rendered the *first person* of the *aorist*, or future, into the *second person* of the *imperative*; has overlooked the conjunction و *warā*; and, what was still more necessary, has omitted to give any English for the *possessive* and *affixed pronoun* ى *yiā*, signifying *my!* whereas the English of this Arabic clause ought to be;—“*and my affair let me relinquish* or *consign into the hands of the Deity:*” as thus, و *and*, ى the *personal*, and here *possessive* pronoun, as an affix to its noun امر *amr*, signifying *my, affair*; افوض *let me, or I will, consign*; الى *unto, or into the hands of*; الله *the Deity or God!*

Before I conclude, I may notice, that in his February rejoinder of the A. J., Munsif, in his farther hypercriticism of Gulchin, is driven to that *opprobrium* of his *fellow professors*, namely of Oriental scholars still being in want of a *fixed* and authorised *orthography* of the *Persian* and *Arabic*, when represented in the *English character*; and charges him with *eleven* fresh errors on this head: but here he is again equally and *uniformly unfortunate*, as I shall prove by quoting two of them, and those very common Persian words: and every one of my imputed errors might be thus made a recharge upon themselves!

1. جهان *Jihān*, as occurring in the word *Farhangi Jihāngīrī*, the name of that dictionary of *pure* Persian words, which, conformably with Sir W. Jones's memorandum of *Desiderata* in the *Persian* language, I make the basis of my projected dictionary: and this Munsif insists on being properly spelled *Jahān*; whereas the *Kashf-al-loghāt*, one of our best native dictionaries, specifically states, that the *Jīm* of this word, when signifying the *world, universe*, and its sense in the compound word *Jihān-gīr*, signifying *world-conquering*, and *seizing*, is accented with a *kas'r*: whereas the *Jīm* of this same word, but signifying *wealth, riches*, is accented with a *fat'h*, and then spelled *Jahān*!

2. فردوس *firdiws*, which the Barhāni Cātai, another respectable native authority, specifies as accented, "*the first and third syllable with a kas'r, and the second syllable quiescent*;"—hence *Firdiwsī*, and not *Firdausī*, as Munsif *ignorantly* insists I should have spelled it, being the title and signifying *celestial*, which Sultan Mahmūd Ghaznowī conferred upon the great Persian epic poet, and the author of the *Shahnāmah*! I beg leave moreover to add, that conformably with common usage, to which the most fastidious find it wise occasionally to concede, I used myself to spell this word *Firdausī*, that is again accenting the third syllable with a *fat'h* instead of a *kas'r*, till I stood corrected by all the best native authorities; but as spelling it *Firdiwsī* might have rather an *uncouth* and *pedantic appearance*, after the common reader had been so long accustomed to the *vulgar* reading, I judged it best to follow the Persian custom of leaving to the scholar to supply the short vowel, and spelt it *Firdōsī*! I quote these two dictionaries, as they alone go in detail upon the accent of the above specified two words.

But it would be intruding too much upon your valuable pages, to specify any more of Munsif's and the Professor's errors; let me therefore for the present subscribe myself

PLATO, HORATIUS, ET ALCÆUS,
EMENDATI.

PHILOSOPHI verba sunt in Phædr. p. 267. Ald. haud longe ab initio :

νῆ τὴν Ἥραν καλή γε ἡ καταγωγή· ἥ τε γὰρ πλάτανος αὕτη μάλα ἀμφιλαφής τε καὶ ὑψηλή· τοῦ τε ἄγνου τὸ ὕψος καὶ τὸ σύσκιον πάγκαλον καὶ ὡς ἀκμὴν ἔχει τῆς ἀνθης ὡς ἂν εὐωδέστατον παρέχοι τὸν τόπον· ἥ γε αὖ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῆς πλατάνου ῥεῖ μάλα ψυχροῦ ὕδατος, ὡς γε τῷ ποδὶ τεκμηρᾶσθαι· Νυμφῶν δέ τινων καὶ Ἀχελώου ἱερὸν ἀπὸ τῶν κορῶν τε καὶ ἀγαλμάτων ἔοικεν εἶναι· εἰ δ' αὖ βούλει τὸ εὐπνουν τοῦ τόπου, ὡς ἀγαπητόν τε καὶ σφόδρα ἡδύ· θερινόν τε καὶ λιγυρὸν ὑπὸν χεῖ τῷ τῶν τεττίγων χορῷ.

Hæc verba, inquit Ruhnken. ad Timæum V. Ἀμφιλαφές, imitando sua fecit Aristænet. 1. 3. ἔνθα πλάτανος μὲν ἀμφιλαφής τε καὶ σύσκιος — μοχ ὡς ἂν εὐωδέστατον παρέχοι τὸν ἐράσμιον τόπον — dein ἡ δὲ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῇ πλατάνῳ ῥεῖ ὕδατος εὐ μάλα ψυχροῦ, ὡς γε τῷ ποδὶ τεκμηρᾶσθαι· — denique τὸ εὐπνουν τῆς αὔρας λιγυρὸν ὑπὸν χεῖ τῷ μουσικῷ τῶν τεττίγων χορῷ.

Mihi vero inter Philosophi verba parum arridet ὕψος post ὑψηλή. Vocem tamen utramque agnoscit Suid. V. Ἄγνος necnon Eustath. Ὀδ. 1. p. 367, 49. Mox πάγκαλον ita nude positum Platona dederet. Dein ἂν — παρέχοι vix satis bene cum sententia convenit. Deinde κορῶν ambiguum est; non enim puellæ ibi tum aderant; neque κορῶν pro κοροκοσμίῳ, uti voluit Ruhnken. ad Tim. V. Κοροπλάθοι. hic intelligi potest. Dein abundat τὸ εὐπνουν τοῦ τόπου propter εὐωδέστατον — τύπον. Deinde ἀγαπητόν vix et ne vix quidem de loco dici potest. Postremo θερινόν — ὑπὸν χεῖ intelligi nequit. Malim igitur totum locum ita legere,

ἥ τε γὰρ πλάτανος αὕτη μάλα ἀμφιλαφής τε καὶ ὑψηλή, τοῦ τε ἄγνου τὸ ὕφαντικὸν ποιεῖ τὸ σύσκιον ὑπ' ἀγκαλῶν, τό τε εὐπνουν, ὡς ἂμ' ἀκμὴν ἔχει τῆς ἀνθης, ὡς ἂμ' εὐωδέστατον παρέχει τὸν τόπον· Νυμφῶν δέ πινων καὶ Ἀχελώου ἱερὸν ἀπὸ τῶν κρουνῶν τε καὶ ἀγαλμάτων ἔοικεν εἶναι· ἥδε γὰρ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῆς πλατάνου ῥεῖ μάλα ψυχροῦ ὕδατος, ὡς γε τῷ ποδὶ τεκμηρᾶσθαι· εἰ δ' αὖ βούλει τι τοῦ ποτοῦ, ὡς

γάλα εὔποτόν ἐστι καὶ σφοδρὰ ἡδὺ εἰληθεροῦντι, καὶ λιγυρὸν ὑπὸ χειρὶ τῶν τεττίγων χορᾶ.

Inter hæc tueri illud ὑφαντικὸν poterit Theocritus in Id. VII. 8. Αἴγειροι πετέαι τε εὔσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον. Ita enim perite admodum corrigit D. Heinsius vice ἔφαινον. Cf. Virgil. *lentæ texunt umbracula vites*. Quod ad verbum ὕφαινον. Similiter in Hom. Ἰλ. Γ. 212. alii μῆτιν ἔφαινον, alii ὕφαινον, quod probum est, propter illud μῆτιν aut δόλους πλέκειν: cui simile est ὑφαίνει μῦθον in Philostrat. de Æsopo, Icon. 3. p. 767. Sed et τε εὔσκιον emendari debuit. Hiatus etenim istiusmodi ferri nequit. Lege Αἴγειροι πετέαι τ' εὔ σύσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον: quo respexit Horatius et ipse corrigendus; *Qua pinus ingens albaque populus Umbram hospitalem consociare amant Ramis, et obliquam laborat Lympha fugam crepitante rivo*. Cf. Ovid. Metam. XI. 604. 'Invitat somnos crepitantibus unda lapillis.' Auctor Copæ, *It* (vulgo *Est*) *strepitans rauco murmure rivus aquæ*. At leniorem sonum voluit Horatius, uti patet ex illis, *Levis crepante lympa desiliit pede*, et *loquaces lymphæ desiliunt*. Quod vulgatur *obliquo laborat Lympha fugax trepidare rivo*, ne Latine quidem dici potest, nedum ad Horatii morem. Redde ὑπ' ἀγκαλῶν, *sub ulnis*.

ὡς ἄμα — ὡς ἄμα — De formula hujusmodi multa Valck. ad Phœn. 1184. et in Not. Mss. penes me subiungit Philostrat. Epist. 33. ὁμοῦ τε ἔθιγεν εὐωδεστέρου χρωτὸς καὶ ἀπάλετο.

Vice κορῶν sententiæ tenor aliquid postulat inanimatum, quod cum ἀγαλμάτων conjungi possit. Conjeci *κρουνῶν*.

Cum verbis ποτοῦ, ὡς γάλα εὔποτόν ἐστι, καὶ σφοδρὰ ἡδὺ conferri possunt εὔποτον γάλα in Æsch. Pers. 611. necnon εὔποτον ῥέος in Prom. 811. ubi Stanl. allegat Achill. Tat. IV. p. 269. γλυκὺ δὲ πινόμενον ἦν: ipse vero ad Æsch. Suppl. 4. addidi Heliodor. II. p. 110. πιεῖν τε ἐστὶ γλυκύτατος, necnon Euripid. Archel. Fragm. a me ita emendatum, *κάλλιστον εὐγλαγοῦς ὕδαρ*. Et sane ποτοῦ legisse videtur Ælian. V. H. XIII. 1. Platonica imitatus ὕδατα — καθαρὰ ἰδεῖν καὶ ψυχρὰ ὅσον τε ἀψαμένῳ τεκμήρασθαι καὶ καταγινῶναι πίνοντι. Verbum paulo infrequens εἰληθερεῖν e Galeno citat Budæus. Quod ad sententiam cf. Æschyl. Agam. 901. *Κάλλιστον — Ὀδοιπὼρ διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος*. Verum Platonica omnia imitatur Theocrit. Id. VII. 135. *ἔν τε βαθείαις Ἀδείας σχίσοιο χαμευνάσιν ἐκλίνθημες*. . . . Πολλὰ δ' ἄμμιν ὑπερθε κατὰ κρατὸς δοιόντο Αἴγειροι πετέαι τε τὸ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδαρ Νυμφᾶν ἐξ ἄντροιο κατειβόμενοι κελεύουσθε' τοὶ δὲ ποτὶ σκιεραῖς ὁροδαμνίσιν ἀβθαλίανες τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες: quæ Bucolica in animo habuit Horatius, *Libet jacere*

modo sub antiqua ilice, Modo in tenaci gramine; Labuntur artis integræ in rivis aquæ, Queruntur in sylvis aves; Frondesque lymphis obstrepunt manantibus; sic enim lego vice altis interim ripis: ubi tamen MS. rivis: recte hoc; cf. pura rivus aquæ: unde restitui integræ, memor Lucretiani juvat integros accedere fontes: mox artis pro altis tuetur eadem var. lect. in Horatianis alto—fruticeto; ubi MSS. arto: dein frondes vice fontes est emendatio Marklandi, advocantis Propertianum Multaque nativis obstrepit arbor aquis, adumbratum ad Theocrit. Id. 1. 1. πίτυς — Ἄ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίσσεται. Hæc obiter. Ad Theocritea priora redeo. Ibi αἰθαλίωνες sunt æstivi. Hoc patet ex Sapphus Fragm. LV. ita emendato in Cl. JI. N. xxvi. p. 370. Πτερύγων ὑπο καρχέει λίγυρ' ἀχέτας ἀοιδὰν, Ὅποταν φλογέραν καθῆτ' ἐπὶ παττάλω κατ' αἶγλαν; cui similia sunt illa Ananii apud Athen. VII. p. 282. C. ὅταν θέρος τ' ἦ, κἀχέται βαβράζωσιν: Pseud-Hesiodi in Ἀσπ. 393. κυανόπτερος ἀχέτα τέττιξ Ὄζω ἐφεζόμενος — χέει αὐδὴν Ἴδει ἐν αἰνοτοτάτῳ (ubi, ut id obiter moneam, lege πυκνόπτερος): Comici in Av. 1095. Ἠνίκ' ὁ θεσπέσιος ὄξυ μέλος ἀχέτας θάλπει μεσημβρίνοις ἡλιομανῆς βοᾷ (quo respexit Clemens Alex. Cohort. p. 2. ὦρα καύματος, ὡπνίκα οἱ τέττιγες ὑπὸ τοῖς πετάλοις ἦδον ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη θερόμενοι ἡλίῳ): necnon Hesiodi in Ἔργ. 581. ἡχέτα τέττιξ Δένδρω ἐφεζόμενος λιγυρὴν κατέχευεν ἀοιδὴν Πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πτερύγων θέρεος καματώδεος ὦρη: ubi Alcæi verba (Fragm. xvi. 111.) facillime sunt eruenda e verbis Procli:

τέγγε πνεύμονα φοῖνω· τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται
 ἃ δ' ὦρα χαλεπά· πάντα δὲ διψᾷντ' ἀπὸ καύματος·
 ἀχεῖ δ' ἐκ πτερύγων ἀδέα τέττιξ ἐπὶ παττάλω·
 ἀνθεὶ δὲ σκόλυμος· νῦν δὲ γυναῖκες μιαιρώταται,
 χ' ἡμεῖς λεπτότατοι, τῶν κεφαλῇν γυῖα τε Σείριος
 ἄξει, καῦμα φέρων· χεῦμα φέρ' οὖν· φοῖνος ἄκος μόνον.

Inter hæc ἀδέα debetur Grævio. Mox ἐπὶ παττάλῳ restituitur Alcæo; quod et Sapphoni conservatum tribuit MS. Demetrii vice ἐπιπτάμενον. Vox eadem excidit et ex Aristoph. Nub. 1421. ubi vulgatur καπὶ ξύλου καθεύδεις: at MS. Rav. καπὶ πλεῖον: lege igitur κὰν παττάλω: excidit quoque vox affinis e fragmento Lyrici apud Hephæst. p. 13=26. ubi nonnulli libri εἰμ ὡ τα πυσσα κωλυθῆσα, alii εἰμ ὡστ' ἀπο πυσσαλῶ λυθῆσα: unde Benth. εἰμ' ὡστ' ἀπ' ὡσσακω λυθῆσα: vero proxime: lege ὦ μῶσ' ἀπ' ὡσσάκω λυθῆσα: cf. Pindar. Ol. 1. 27. ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου λάμβανε. Synonyma sunt ὡσσακος et πάσσαλος. Photius Ὑσσακούς· τοὺς πασσάλους. Ἀριστοφάνης Λυσιστράτη, καὶ οἱ Δωριεῖς. Dein γυῖα τε Σείριος ἄξει plane tuetur Pseud-Hesiod. Ἀσπ. 395. Ἴδει ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ, ὅποτε χρόα Σείριος ἄξει: quibus ipse subjunxit καῦμα

φέρων, memor Horatiani *Adduxere sitim tempora: et sane καῦμα φέρων* legisse videtur Proclus, cujus sunt verba, καὶ γὰρ οὗτος, scil. Σείριος, — καυμάτων αἰτίος ἔστω, et mox τίνα οὖν ἄκη τοῦ καύματος, unde erui οἶνος ἄκος μόνον: quod commune aliquid habet cum dicto Epinici apud Athen. x. p. 432. D. πῶμα καύματος λύσιν.

G. B.

REMARKS ON

Mr. Bellamy's New Translation of the Old Testament.

PART. I.

SCARCELY in this country has a work of the nature of Mr. Bellamy's been ushered into the world with such a display of great names: never, perhaps, was there a more favorable time for such a work. The publication of the infidel works of Paine, Volney, and others, had excited the public mind in no ordinary degree. Mr. B. had, for years past, been in the constant practice of holding himself forth as the only person capable (for, according to him, no person had done it) of repelling those objections which unbelievers, ever since the time of Porphyry and Celsus, had been in the habit of bringing against the Christian religion; he was continually asserting that there had been no translation from the Hebrew since the 128th year of Christ; that Jerome principally followed the Septuagint, being but little acquainted with the Hebrew, when he made that translation which has ever since gone under the name of the Vulgate; that many errors had crept into that celebrated version; that the nations of modern Europe, when they translated the Bible into their various vernacular tongues, on account of their ignorance of Hebrew, were obliged to have recourse to the Septuagint and Vulgate; and that, consequently, all the errors of those ancient versions (which according to Mr. Bellamy are neither few nor small) have been retained in all the translations of the present day; giving occasion for the impious rail

lery of infidels, with whom, to all appearance, he had sworn to wage an exterminating war. The result of all this was, that his work was anxiously looked for, and, for some time, readily bought. But, such are the mutations of this world! we shortly heard no more of it, except from the Reviews which attacked it, and it speedily sunk into comparative obscurity.—We might, perhaps, without running the risk of going very far wrong, conclude that its learned author had failed in realising those pleasing illusions, in making good those unmeasured assertions by means of which he had rivetted, for a while, the public attention.

That such, Sir, was really the case, was soon made evident by many of the periodicals, which pointed out many of his errors; but by no publication was it so clearly shown, as by that of Mr. Whittaker, which I shall now, as shortly as is consistent with perspicuity, notice.

Mr. W. has divided his book into three chapters and an Appendix; the two first chapters are subdivided each into 4 sections, the third chapter is continued undivided throughout.

The first section of the 1st chapter is devoted to the enquiry, what use a judicious author, in translating the Bible, would make of former versions. Mr. W. commences this enquiry by stating "*what is meant when we say that any particular translation of the Bible was made from the original languages.*" "By these words" (says Mr. W.) "it is merely understood, that its authors regarded nothing *as authority*, except the original Hebrew of the Old, and the original Greek of the New Testament, a condition which is evidently not violated by their consulting any number of prior translations during the progress of their work. No person would attempt a new version, without availing himself of the labors of former interpreters, unless his discretion was altogether overcome by self-conceit, or he was so bad a critic as not to be aware of the advantages resulting from a comparison of different independent translations. Accordingly, those who have undertaken this arduous task have invariably paid the greatest deference to their learned predecessors; which respect has generally been proportioned to their own modesty, and has therefore been most shown by men of the highest attainments. That degree of confidence in his own acquirements, which leads a translator to neglect or under-rate those who have gone before him, usually proceeds from vanity, and may be esteemed no unsure token of inconsiderate rashness."¹

“If in translating the Old Testament he considers none of the versions thus employed as of *ultimate* and *decisive* authority, it is contended that his translation is made from the original Hebrew, and from nothing else.”¹ With these observations, Sir, I entirely agree, and I am persuaded that your readers will be of the same opinion.

In the second section of this chapter Mr. W. proceeds to set those right, who may have been misled by the charges which Mr. B. has thought proper to prefer against Jerome and the Latin Vulgate; and the manner in which he has accomplished this demands the highest praise. As it would, however, be impossible to do justice to his treatment of this part of the case by an extract, I must beg leave to refer your readers to the work itself. In the third section Mr. Whittaker, in opposition to the assertions of Mr. Bellamy that “*the common translations in all the European languages were made from the modern Septuagint and Vulgate*,”² shows the ignorance under which Mr. Bellamy must have labored when he made those sweeping charges; he has produced a list of more than twenty versions, the greater part of which, he has indisputably shown, were made *directly* from the Hebrew. Mr. Bellamy has stated, that Pagninus attempted to rectify Jerome’s errors full *twenty years before* a copy of the Hebrew Bible was printed, and his inaccuracy has been as decidedly proved in this instance as it was in the former. So far from its being true that no copy of the Hebrew Bible was printed until twenty years after the version of Pagninus had made its appearance, the fact is, that, in the short space of the *thirty eight years preceding the publication of Pagninus’s translation*, there had been no fewer than *twelve editions* of the Hebrew Bible struck off.

This *erudite* translator, Sir, had vaunted much of the light he was able to throw upon the *Keri Notes*; they had hitherto, he said, been supposed to *contradict* the *Chetib*; but the happy moment had at length arrived when mankind, after a worse than Cimmerian darkness of more than 1700 years, were, according to his account, to have their eyes opened on this important subject. They would find that, so far from any *opposition*, there was nothing but *harmony*, and that the delusion arose from the former *translators* and *revisers* having been totally unacquainted with the *accentual reading*. But here again, Sir, we are doomed

to suffer another disappointment; for so far is our author from being able to instruct others on this point, that he seems quite to have misunderstood the nature of the Keri notes himself. This subject is discussed pretty much at large in the 1st section of the 2nd class of Mr. Whittaker's Historical and Critical Enquiry.

I have now arrived at that part of Mr. Whittaker's book which treats of the Hebrew accents, the knowledge of which department of learning Mr. Bellamy has arrogated to himself exclusively; his ignorance of the subject has, however, been shown in the most glaring colors. This subject occupies the 2nd section of the 2nd chapter of the Critical and Historical Enquiry.

In the 3rd section of this chapter Mr. Bellamy, so far from having made those discoveries which he had so loudly proclaimed, is shown to be unacquainted with the subject of the *conversive conjunction Vau*, and, in the fourth section, to be equally uninstructed on the subject of the reciprocity (of which reciprocity he had denied the existence) of the *preterite* and *future tenses* in *Hebrew*. The remaining chapter is devoted to a minute enquiry into his qualifications for becoming a translator and expositor of the Hebrew Bible. After what has been already seen of this gentleman's critical abilities, you will not, Sir, be surprised to find that he has been proved deficient in those qualifications which have, heretofore, been looked upon as requisites in an undertaking of this description.

It must not however, Sir, be concealed, that Mr. Bellamy has published 156 pages of what he calls a Critical Examination and a Refutation of the objections which Mr. Whittaker had raised against his translation. Your readers will be surprised when I inform them, that he has not answered any one of Mr. W.'s objections. The whole of his book is a tissue of the most unfounded assertions. Many, indeed, of his former statements he has, as far as silence may be construed into consent, abandoned; but still the errors which he thinks it incumbent on him to defend, surpass every thing I have yet met with.

I have, Sir, given this short account of Mr. Whittaker's Critical Enquiry into the merits of Mr. Bellamy's translation, that it may be clearly perceived, that, before he published the two following parts of his work, he had had sufficient notice given him of his errors, to prevent him from falling into errors of the same description in any future parts of his translation. He did

not, however, profit from this in his subsequent part, and, consequently, Mr. W., faithful to his promise, published a supplement to his *critical enquiry*, convicting Mr. B. of the same ignorance of the simplest rules of the Hebrew language in the second, which he had already displayed in his first part.

The mistakes, arising from violations of the first principles of the Hebrew Grammar, amount to the astonishing number of 189, which added to 134, the amount of those in his first part, make 323! And yet they bear but a small proportion to those which might have been enumerated; for, says Mr. W., "*those mistakes which have arisen from giving words a different sense from that which they really bear, or other senses which they may in some cases require, comprising all perversions which do not involve the charge of grammatical ignorance, will not be noticed at all. Had any attempt been made to collect such errors, the file would have been gigantic.*" Whether such animadversions as these on his first and second parts, have produced that effect on our ingenious Critic in conducting his third part, which they ought to have done; whether he have betaken himself to his Hebrew grammar, and made himself acquainted, as every one who pretends to translate ought to be, with the nouns, pronouns, and verbs, as well regular as irregular and defective, in their various moods and conjugations; whether he have abandoned that unmeasured abuse of all who have labored in the same vineyard for the last 1700 years; and whether he have succeeded in putting his translation, I will not say, into language equally impressive, beautiful and clear as that of the authorised version, but at least into language that may be understood, and that does not violate every rule of grammar and of composition, I shall now, Sir, briefly enquire.

The 16th chapter of the book of Numbers is the first complete chapter of our author's third part, and, unfortunately for him, he gives a wrong translation of the very first verse by rendering בְּנֵי רְעֻבֵן "*the son of Reuben,*" instead of "*sons of Reuben,*" as in the authorised version; nor is he more fortunate in his attempt to mend the language of the common version in the fourth and fifth verses: the juxtaposition of the two translations will, perhaps, better enable your readers to appreciate their respective merits.

New Translation.

4. When Moses heard, then,
he fell before his face.

5. And he spake to Korah,
VOL. XXVI.

Common Version.

4. And when Moses heard
it, he fell upon his face.

5. And he spake unto Korah,
NO. LI. 1.

Cl. JI.

and to all his company, saying : and unto all his company, saying, *In the morning*, (for Jehovah will distinguish who are for him and who are consecrated) then he will approach before him; yea, concerning whom he will select for himself, he will draw near to him. ing, Even to-morrow the Lord will show who *are* his, and *who is holy*; and will cause *him* to come near unto him; even *him*, whom he hath chosen, will he cause to come near unto him.

However strange it may appear to those who have not been in the habit of perusing the lucubrations of this sagacious author, he substitutes this mass of obscurity as an *improvement* on the authorised version! What meaning he may attach to this collection of words, I am quite incapable of determining.

The twelfth verse of this chapter is thus given in our common version: "*And Moses sent to call Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab; which said, We will not come up:*" and people have generally supposed that Dathan and Abiram, when they used the words "We will not come up," refused to go to Moses, who had sent for them; not so, however, our critic, who thus instructs us in his note, which at least has the merit of being short, "*We will not come.* The word נעלה *naegneleh*, does not embrace the meaning of *come*, but to *ascend*; that is, to ascend to the land of Canaan!!"

In his note on the 17th verse, we perceive a striking proof of the great care that Mr. Bellamy has taken not to misrepresent the version which he pretends to correct. "*Each of you his censer.* The word וקהו *ukehow*, the imperative of the verb to *take*, is omitted in the common version. It describes the manner in which they were to approach, viz. Heb. *And take ye.*" The propriety of this note will be apparent when the two translations are placed before your readers:

Common Version.

17. And take every man his censer, and put incense therein, &c. &c.

New Translation.

17. And take ye every man his censer, and put incense therein, &c. "

It would be needless for me, Sir, to call the attention of your readers, after the above specimens, to the rest of this chapter: suffice it to say that Mr. Bellamy goes on, in the same manner, charging the translators with errors which they have not committed, and proposing new renderings which can never be sustained, being alike opposed to the plain meaning of the original, and the idiom of our own language. I shall therefore proceed and examine some of the more obvious errors of which he has been guilty in the subsequent pages of this part of his work.

We find the authorised translation of the 10th verse of the 17th chapter to be, "*And the Lord said unto Moses, Bring Aaron's rod again before the testimony, to be kept for a token against the rebels; and thou shalt quite take away their murmurings from me, that they die not.*" Although this rendering is quite consistent with the sense of the original, and perfectly intelligible to any one who understands English, it does by no means suit the refined taste of our Critic, who thus tries his hand at amendment: "*And Jehovah said to Moses, Bring the rod of Aaron in the front of the testimony, to be kept for a token before the children of the rebels: thus thou shalt end their murmurings against me, that they die not.*" It will be perceived from Mr. B.'s note, that he objects chiefly to the words "*against the rebels,*" in our version, charging our learned translators with having omitted the word לִבְנֵי. The fact is, as might be supposed, that those excellent scholars did not omit this word; they found in the original לִבְנֵי מִרְּבִיר against the children of rebellion; and instead of this Hebraism they adopted the plain English word "rebels," which exactly answers to the sense of the original. But Mr. B. renders the singular noun מִרְּבִיר as if it had been in the plural number, and then proceeds to accuse our translators of not having given the meaning of the clause! In his note on the 21st verse of the following chapter, he, in like manner, charges King James' translators with having omitted the word חֲלֵפִי chaleph in their version, which they have not omitted; and absolutely calls the participle עֲבָדִים gnobdim, a noun plural, and translates it servants; referring his readers for authority for such a novel rendering, to Gen. ix, 25. Lev. xxx, 55. 1 Sam. xvii, 8. where the word does not occur, unless he have abandoned the vowel points, which he has over and over again declared to be of equal antiquity and authority with the consonants. But leaving, for the sake of argument, the points out of the question, the construction of the passage will show every body acquainted in the slightest degree with the Hebrew, that the consonants compose a participle in Numbers, and a noun substantive in each of the three passages to which he has referred. In a note on the 26th verse of the 20th chapter, we find the following piece of information: "Four times the translators have rendered the ׀ vau, in this verse, by the conjunction copulative and; whereas, according to rule, it occurs only once." What this rule is, or whether its discovery is one of the fortunate results of his profound researches into the doctrine of the accents, our author has not deigned to let us know.

[To be concluded in our next.]

OXFORD LATIN PRIZE POEM, FOR 1822.

ALPES AB ANNIBALE SUPERATÆ.

Romanis arcibus olim
Exitium magnum, atque Alpes immittet apertas.

TURBAM inter, fremitusque, et pallenti agmina luctu,
Sterneris ad templa, et frustra veneraris iniquos,
Roma, Deos; toto circum portenta moveri
Visa polo, Stygiis Sol immiscerier umbris,
(Infandum!) diroque rubescere sidera bello.

Ergo in Romuleos male conjurata Penates
Fata ruunt; non illa novas avertere pompas
Diis Superis visum, non sanctæ oracula Sibyllæ.

Ergo erit, ut seras multo cum sanguine pœnas
Exacuant Manes, et Dii morientis Elisæ!
Illa amens animi, et furiis bacchata cruentis,
Impia fatali pinguescere littora cæde
Audiet, ultoremque armari in prælia Martem;
Audiet, ac sævo vix jam satiata triumpho,
Læta omen feret, et gressu insultabit ovanti!

Victor ab Oceano, Zephyrique tepentibus arvis,
Barbaricas vires, et belli immania monstra,
Pœnus agit, durasque ardens Eversor ad Alpes
Fulminat—una omnis ruit in eertamina pubes,
Cæde recens Afer, niveisque Hispanus in armis,
Et quos terribili spirantem funera vultu
Gallia alit prolem, volucrumque agitator equorum
Infrenis Numida, et fundæ Balearica virtus.

Gallorum circa campi—pleno æstuat amne
Proruptum volvens Rhodanus mare—dura coronant
Saxa super, cœlique oris miscentur apertis.
Naturæ salvete domi! (seu numinè templa
Digna suo, mediisque æternas nubibus aras,
Omnipotens dedit; aut cædes miseratus acerbas
Irarum finem, et divisi mœnia mundi,
Immotis posuit claustris;) vos ardua supra
Relligio, Terrorque, sedet; vos pallida vestit

Majestas, gelidaque horrens Formidine Letum.
 Hoc solium sibi fixit Hyems; super omnia torpent,
 Æternum diadema, nives; furit improba circum
 Tempestas, ignesque, et viva tonitrua, densat:
 Innumeri reboant montes, totoque tremiscit
 Exanimis Natura sinu; tam lurida noctis
 Caligo, et sævi nigrescere Turbinis ira,
 Et circumfusi late ruere atria cœli.
 Audin? ut insano fracta de rupe tumultu
 Præcipitat moles, fulmen nivis! aspera nutant
 Saxa procul, sylvæque ruunt, præruptaque passim
 Fragmina, et horrificis trepidarunt antra ruinis.

Extemplo ingenti secum ferverescere motu
 Pœnus, et optato turbari pectora visu;
 'Tandem,' ait, 'hic nostris succumbit terminus armis;
 Numen adest; sic ante preces, sic vota fuere.
 Hic ubi devicto fluitantia vertice signa
 Instituiam, et dulces Italum spatia labor ad auras,
 Ausoniæ fletus, Romanorumque ruinas,
 Aure bibam, tremuloque metus suspiria vento.
 Me Capitolini victorem ad limina templi
 Innumeræ metuent gentes; me numina Divum,
 Et sancti Patres, et Plebs invisâ Quirini
 Agnoscet Dominum, et justo exornabit honore.
 Cæde aræ rubeant, per tecta madentia cæde,
 Exercete iram, sævasque immitte flammæ,
 Impiæque æternæ succumbant sæcula nocti.'

Talia venturæ spirans insomnia famæ
 Barbarus, ac coëptis ingentibus effera volvens
 Læmina, per densos, furialia corda, maniplos,
 Urget iter; non ille epulas, aut munera Bacchi,
 Assuetus colere, aut festi convivia luxus,
 Sed mores rigidi, sed mens exercita curis,
 Immortale odium, et cari genitoris Imago,
 Accendunt animum, et belli insatiabilis ardor.

Quin omnis subit ista olim sanctissima pompa,
 Cum Superos, Manesque, ultro testatus, ad aras
 Staret, et æternos odii servanda per annos
 Vota daret; rutilis fulsere altaria flammis
 Conscia, et attonitæ sacrarunt omnia turmæ.

Atqui ipsum (ni vana fides) monuere Deorum
 Prodigia, et victas monstrarunt ordine gentes,
 Ut, fati interpret, diva appareret Imago,
 (Altum inter somnum, mediæque silentia noctis)

Squamigerumque atro sequeretur corpore monstrum;
 Tum ruere infandæ strages, sylvæque tremantes
 Prosterni, et magnum percurrere murmura cœlum.

Jamque omnis properanda via est; tota undique castra
 Pulvere misceri, et nigram increbrescere nubem
 Aspicio. Tu! qui gelida dominaris in arce,
 Regna tenens, horrende Geni! cui informia parent
 Frigora, cui saxis superimpendentia saxa,
 Pande tuæ penetrale domus, daque omnia versu
 Rite sequi; tu nam medias nova bella per arces
 Vidisti ingruere, et solio sublimis in alto
 Non impune tuos violarier hoste recessus!

Ergone Naturæ duros perrumpere fines,
 Maxime, inaccessasque gravi quater agmine nubes,
 Ausus eras, nulloque calentia sidere regna.
 Nil hyemis valere minæ, nil ira Deorum,
 Ingentem turbare animum; ruis arduus alto
 Bella movens cœlo, et superos armaris in hostes.
 Quid memorem erroresque viæ, turbataque passim
 Agmina, et infestos glaciali frigore cursus?
 Quid dubias penitus subtorlabentia rupes
 Flumina, ut insano spumantia vortice fervent,
 Avulsosque globos, disjectaque fragmina volvunt?
 Ipse Alpes miscere suas, et turbida visus
 Regna Deus. Quoties ruptis infida cavernis
 Dissiluere antra, atque infra Plutonia pallent
 Tartara, et invisi late penetralia Ditis!
 Parte alia, intonsæ, pubes montana, catervæ
 Impendent capiti, feraliaque agmina jungunt;
 Discurrunt, variantque vices, pugnamque lacessunt
 Infensi, latebrisque iterum celantur opacis;
 Rursus in arma ruunt, duramque trahentia mortem
 Saxa rotant, longisque acuunt ululatibus iras.
 Obstupuere animi, ut sævas nemora horrida voces
 Ingeminant, ictusque cadentum, et vulnera utrinque
 Cæca, percussisque sonant in vallibus arma.

Interea nonum reparabat in æthere solem
 Alma Dies—summo insultans in vertice Pœnus
 Explicuit signa, atque optata in sede superbit:
 Hinc procul Ausoniæ campi, felicia rura,
 Visa oculis: mediis se infert pulcherrimus agris
 Fluviorum rex Eridanus, sacrisque vagatur
 Vallibus, et pingui ditat sua gurgite regna.
 Hic vèrè assiduo spirant ridentia prata,

Et spissæ lucorum umbræ, castique recessus.
Hic lætæque oleæ; et vitis gratissima Baccho,
Aurea purpureis distinguit culta racemis.
Continuo mirari omnes, finemque laborum
Amplecti procul, et visu mansuescere corda;
Ut placidæ sedes, et fortunata virescant
Regna hominum, rigisque errent in vallibus undæ;
Ut fluvios, vivosque lacus, sylvasque comantes,
Egregiasque urbes infra, et delubra Deorum,
Oppidaque antiqua dudum florentia pace,
Diffundat radiis, et in auret lumine cœlum.

“En dignæ Divum sedes! en aurea regna
Italix,” exclamat; “jam victæ incendia genti
Ferte, Saguntinoque recentia tela cruore.
Vos neque perpetuis urgens Hispania bellis,
Nec Pyrenæi nigra formidine saltus,
Non tanti domuere hostes; superatus Iberus,
Et rigidi Volcæ, et Rhodanus violentior undis,
Et nullis parens insana Druentia ripis.
Hinc faciles cursus, hinc mollia rura; laborum
Præmia, devotique hostes; jam moenia Romæ
Procumbunt, aræque, et desolata nigrescunt
Templa Deum, et mistis Capitolia versa ruinis.”

Ergo iterum toto spirans e pectore martem,
Arma rapit, properoque instat descendere cursu,
Bellatorum acies: quis longam iterare laborum
Rite velit seriem? quis saxa liquentia flammis
Dicat, et insolitis pacatas viribus Alpes?
At vos, O Superi, quorum sub numine Roma est,
Infandum prohibetê nefas! prohibete piorum
Exitium, et priscos gentis servate triumphos!
Eheu! si poterunt unquam fata aspera rumpi,
Saltem aliquod tardate malum! furit horridus armis
Afer, et ad fractas tonat ingens Annibal aras.

Tandem igitur latis Italum spatiariis in arvis,
Carthago; totis tremuerunt agmina campis,
Ut sævas hominum species, ignotaque castra,
Squallentemque manu, et deformia monstra, elephantas
Aspiciunt—magnas volat improba fama per urbes,
Dira monens procul, et terror comitatur euntem,
Romanasque quatit præ sagis motibus arces:
Testor te, fluctu labens Ticinæ cruento,
Vos, fontes Trebiæ, et Thrasymeni nobilis unda,
Testor vos, Romæ fatalia nomina, Cannæ,

Quis belli furor, et quanti tibi, Pœne, triumphi,
 Ante odium cœli, tristisque resederit ira,
 Ante graves Stygio requierint littore Manes.
 At tu, quisquis eris, cui sint mortalia curæ,
 Contemplare breves pompas, perituraque regna,
 Infelix ! et res tecum meditare caducas.
 Hic veteres inter tumulos, dilapsaque sana
 Roma jacet ; frustra deserti in littoris ora
 Errabis, magnamque petes Carthaginis umbram.
 Una urbes, odiumque, silent ; quis in arma vocabit
 Scipiadam, aut belli jactantem fulmina Pœnum ?
 Forsitan et fractis super illacrymere tropæis
 Et tristi accumules dono ; ‘ Quibus exul in oris
 Umbra, gemis, sedesque et non tua littora servas ?
 Atqui non patrii ritus, non flebilis olim
 Bellatorum ordo, lacrymæque et vota tuorum,
 Composuere senem tumulo, cœloque dedere,
 Pœne, Deum ; non solenni Victoria pompa
 Signat humum, sanctamque irrorat fletibus urnam ;
 At decussus honor, mixtoque Infamia luctu,
 Eripuere diem ; at Romani sanguinis ultor,
 Regnorumque potens, tremefactique arbiter ævi,
 Annulus ; Ausoniis caput execrabile Diris
 Ille dedit, scelerumque ultricibus abstulit undis.
 Scilicet hic rerum finis ; quid inania questu
 Projicimus verba, aut tristi indulgemus amor ?
 Hic Virtus, Nomenque jacent ; nil sanguine tellus,
 Pinguis et armorum sonitu perterritus orbis,
 Nil reliqui fecere—brevis Deus omnia claudit
 Limite, præteritisque æquat præsentia fatum.’

F. CURZON,

COLL. ÆN. NAS.

OXFORD PRIZE ESSAY, FOR 1822.

An re vera prævaluerit apud eruditiores antiquorum Polytheismus.

Quocumque te flexeris, ibi Deum vides occurrentem tibi.—SENECA.

ARGUMENTUM.

Introductio.—Exponitur quid sit Polytheismus.—Eruditiores antiquorum potuissent pervenire ad Unum Deum agnoscendum, natura monstrante iter, et aliquid porro afferente luminis disciplina a maioribus qualicunque tradita.—Idem de Uno Deo sæpissime locuti sunt.—Queritur quibus e rationibus fluxerit plurium Deorum mentio, et qualibus rebus veteres imposuerint nomen Dei.—Petuntur argumenta e sacrosanctis literis, quæ monent Polytheismum apud eruditiores antiquorum non valuisse.

ILLIS profecto qui humanitatis studiis assidue colendis favent, condonandum est si eorum fuerint paulo studiosiores quæ dixerit, quæ judicaverit, quæ literis mandaverit antiquitas. Nihil vero magis dignum est quod curam moveat, quam illa de natura divina opinio, quæ apud eruditiores veterum valuerit. Hac enim in explicanda elaboraverunt viri, quibus nihil a doctrina non delatum videtur: hac de re dissidentes Philosophi docuerunt quid esset in humano ingenio acuminis et virium, et quibus in erroribus idem teneatur illaqueatum, simul ac fines divinitus positos ausum fuerit temere transgredi.

Possumus igitur tum emolumentum percipere tum voluptatem, ex hac re penitus investigata: sed cum tam longe lateque pateat, cum tanta de his certetur dissensione, ab iis qui eloquentia sæpissime usi sunt ad celandum, potius quam ad proferendum, id quod ipsis persuasum esset, cum tanta interdum in eodem scriptore extent, ambiguis obvoluta verbis, aut inter se repugnantia, diligentiam maximam adhibeamus oportet, ut in his ambagibus certa quædam ratio inesse appareat, et ut huic obscuritati lumen literarum subvenire possit. Difficilis sane est quæstio, petentibus nobis quid tacite cogitaverint eruditiores antiquorum de natura summi illius imperit quo moventur atque gubernantur omnia. Qui autem argumenta sunt adlaturi quæ moneant ne apud eos Polytheismus valuisse credamus, ii accurate definiant necesse est, quam vim huic verbo subjectam velint, ut in aperto ponatur id de quo lis intenditur: statuatur itaque Polytheismus plurium societas Deorum, per se ab æterno existentium, ac res hominum suo arbitrio curantium. Orta igitur de hac re controversia, priusquam

ad ea devenit sit quæ, literis tradita, temporis injuria parum violavit, non alieni juris fuerit ab argumentis proficisci e nuda ratione rei petitis, et sciscitari utrum mens humana, suis tantummodo freta viribus, ductura foret ad Unum Deum agnoscendum, eos qui, ingenio olim florentes, veri reperiendi studio flagrant. Quod si quis negaverit, natura duce, homines ferri ad aliquam confitendam potentiam quæ mundum regat, næ ille reclamantem habuerit omnium gentium historiam, ex qua abunde constat hanc notionem, si non sponte insita sit in animis hominum, ad primas tamen opiniones revocari et referri. De eo solum ambigitur, an ea quæ cernuntur id momenti habitura essent, ut suaderent eruditiores veterum, mundum unius, potius quam plurium, mente ac consilio gubernari.

Hic vero nequaquam accedendum est ad exquisitas illas subtilitates disputandi, quibus scilicet, aut acute inventis, aut perite dictis, uti liceret, si id ageretur ut commonstremus Deum unum esse: sed ea potius adeamus argumenta, quæ ex admiratione cœlestium rerum atque terrestrium necessario videntur oritura, quæque ultro obventura forent Philosophis veritatem unice colentibus.

Hi profecto sensuri essent tempestatum varietatem, certo revolvendum ordine, quarum porro mutationes modum conservant adeo temperatum et constantem, ut in his nihil conturbet infinita sæculorum series; sensuri essent motus æquabilitatem qua utuntur¹ solis lunæque cursus, astra etiam ita invicem locos mutantia, ut, certis circumactis temporibus, sua vestigia repetant, et eadem spatia conficiant, nulla his interveniente discordia quæ plurium Deorum potentiam indicaret. Eodem accedat oportet ut ubique locorum eandem visuri essent naturam, iisdem obsequentem legibus; eandem scilicet conversionem² coeli, eosdem marinorum æstuum accessus et recessus, et eam denique consensionem rerum, cum quasi simplicis et absoluti operis effectum, ut animis illico arrepturi essent unum numen, a quo administrarentur et cui pareant omnia.

Sed si verisimile sit unius notionem Dei sponte sua sese oblaturam fore naturam contemptantibus, alii etiam tunc temporis non defuerunt fontes, unde eadem sententia ad

¹ At vigiles mundi magnum et vorsatile templum

Sol et luna tuo lustrantes lumine circum

² Perdocuere homines annorum tempora vorti :

Et certa ratione geri rem, atque ordine certo.

Lucretius, lib. v. 1435.

eruditorem quemque permanasse potuerit: cum enim¹ abunde constet plurima ad hos pervenisse antiquitus tradita, et cum nobis religio sit dubitare an unius Dei cultus fuerit commissus primis hominibus, quid vetat quin, una cum rebus ita traditis, hic cultus quoque locum habuerit? Quod quo facilius credamus, in memoriam revocandum est, iis, qui Græciæ philosophiam induxerint, frequens olim cum Ægyptiis Tyriisque commercium interfuisse, quibus notissima erat Judæorum de uno Deo sententia.

Neque committendum est ut dixisse videamur nos, his modo adlatis, rem prorsus dijudicatam habere; id tamen iis inesse auctoritatis placet, ut moneant, eorum opinionem quibus visum est Polytheismum non valuisse apud eruditiores antiquorum, non modo non absurdam esse, sed eam esse quæ, lite adhuc manente integra, menti potissimum se commendaret.

Hac itaque præmunita via, faciliorem cursum oratio tenebit, ad Philosophorum scripta investiganda jam accedens: quorum tanta est copia, ut decisis omnino quotquot ab Eleatica profecti disciplina, omnem numinis metum, pietatem omnem sanctitatemque e vita sustulerint, materies tamen relicta erit pene amplior quam fort. instituti hujus ratio.

Neque sanè moras nectemus Ionicam scholam ab initio repetentes; quoniam qui ante Socratem primas in hac adepti sunt, solum occupati videntur in iis quæ ad Physicorum prudentiam spectant: quæ quidem studia, per se semper jucundissima, illa tempestate ceteris etiam tutiora erant, propter quod tyranni civitatibus Græciæ insidentes, iis volendis faverent potius, quæ eruditorum animos averterent a quæstionibus ad jus humanum et civitates administrandas pertinentibus, aut ad ea officia quibus nexa est ac colligata societas.

In Socrate autem laudando quamvis nemo nimius esse potest, tamen hic loci non necesse est ut oratio longior ponatur; tantum enim abest ut ille uberrime de divina natura disputaverit, ut ab ea re potius avocandos homines judicaverit, cui investigandæ mentis humanæ acies impar omnino esset atque impotens. Sed cum hunc videamus plane dissentientem iis fabulis quibus referta esset popularis superstitio, et Anaxagoræ illi annuentem cui persuasum fuerit universum naturæ corpus ab una quadam contineri mente, a materie prorsus sejuncta, jure quodam colligimus plurimum

¹ Aristotel. Metaph. xiv. 8.

societatem Deorum ab ejus philosophia maxima alienam esse.

Ventum igitur est, relicto Socrate, ad scholam Platonis, deinde ad eos qui Aristotelem omnibus anteponendum arbitrabantur. Aliis vero præcepta Zenonis arridebant, quibus cum adjecerimus Pythagoræ discipulos, quatuor habebimus præcipuas Græcæ philosophiæ partes, quæ rem nostram causamque continent. Neque nobis id severe nimis est objiciendum, si prætermittamus eam repetitam quidem ab Arcesilao, a Carneade vero confirmatam, disciplinam: quid enim magis inutile esset quam quærere quid ii senserint, quibus placuerit omnia esse adeo circumfusa tenebris, ut nihil cognosci, nihil pro certo percipi aut sciri possit? Ad Platonem vero devenientes, non est cur miremur quamplurima apud eum inter se repugnare; quippe cui mos ille cordi erat ab Ægypto petitus, tradendi scilicet doctrinæ mutuo discrepantes, quarum hæc veritati studeret, illa utilitati; hæc paucis explicaret id quod unicuique Philosopho persuasum esset, illa coram omnibus proferret, quæ ad plebem in officio retinendam maxime accommodata viderentur. Quæ cum ita sint, oratio illa quæ inscribitur Timæus digna omnino judicanda est quæ ante alias adeatur: in hac enim consulto agitur ac fuse de divina providentia; hanc igitur appellat Cicero, ad hanc confugit Plutarchus, quoties veras Platonis sententias reperire et expromere velint.

Multa idcirco in Timæo disputat Plato, ut probet quam difficile sit illum quasi parentem mundi invenire, quum autem inveneris, eundem in vulgus proferre, nefas ducit: docet idem materiem primo extitisse, quæ vim habuerit omnia accipiendi; hanc, ordine carentem et concordia, aspexisse, temperasse, et in modum reduxisse, unum mundi opificem ac molitorem Deum. Ex hac materie ita deposita, quoniam invito numine dissolvi non potest, fit totius orbis compages, mutuis apte inter se ordinatis partibus. Sed ne luce egerent hæc omnia adeo expressa et effecta, exoritur, præter lunam et errantium flammæ siderum, sol etiam, qui in causa est cur certa ferantur ratione tempestatum varietates, ac gratæ dierum noctiumque vicissitudines. Quid vero necesse est Platonem sequi de ceteris mundi disserentem partibus? jam enim patet, id quod caput est, dedisse eum tanto operi, unum plane auctorem et effectorem.

Proximum est ut ad Aristotelem accedamus, cujus ingenium acro et acutum, exhaustis omnibus quæ in terra, cœlo,

marique natura ostendit, seipsum tandem contulit ad humanum genus contemplandum: quod cum animadvertisset et sentire, et ratione uti, mentem ꝑdcirco collegit hominibus insitam: deinde aliquid excogitavit necesse esse hac ipsa mente præstantius, quod *ἐνέργεια*¹ dictum voluit. Ex hac² pendet naturæ ordo, hæc omnia movet, tractat, complectitur, hæc³ una est atque simplex, hæc denique Deus est.

Relictis Peripateticis sequuntur Stoici, quorum in sententiis indagandis Cicerone uti duce licet. Apud quem cum Balbo tribuantur partes, ut Zenonis opiniones explicet, nititur profecto ille ipso illo argumento quod nos valere apud eruditos initio suspicati sumus. Cœlestia enim observans rogat, "Quid potest esse tam apertum tamque perspicuum, quam esse aliquod numen præstantissimæ mentis quo hæc regantur."⁴ Iisdem utitur argumentis Chrysippus, iisdem Cleanthes, quorum hic cum videret solis, lunæ, siderumque omnium, varietatem, pulchritudinem, cursum, tantos motus statuit ab aliqua mente gubernari; alter agnoscens "tam constantem rerum ordinem ab homine non posse confici, ad Deum confugit, et hæc ita fieri negat, nisi ea uno divino et continuato spiritu contineantur."

Neque non breviter hic loci attingendum videtur quod Stoici de fato dixerint: quæ vis, sive eam fatum dici maluerint, sive sempiternam seriem causarum, nihil aliud revera est, nisi ratio in mente supremi numinis concepta, e qua, cum perfecta sit, Deus degredi nescit. Quo etiam spectant Senecæ verba, "Ille ipse omnium conditor atque rector scripsit quidem fata, sed sequitur, semper paret, semel jussit."

Jam vero quæstionem initam de iis quæ Pythagoras censuerit, perdifficilem haud dubie judicabit, qui in memoriâ revocaverit quam obscuris loquendi formulis, et quasi mysteriis, obvolvantur ejusdem præcepta, quæ ad bene vivendum pertinent. Accidit autem fortuito, ut id quod nos jam petendum curamus, pendeat statim ab ipsis hujus Philosophiæ principiis. Pythagoras enim, imaginem quærens quæ clariorem redderet suam de divina natura sententiam, incidit in numerorum seriem: et quemadmodum hi omnes, qualescunque sint, ab uno profuant necesse est, ita docuit

¹ ὁ γὰρ τοῦς ἐνέργεια. Metaph. xiv. 6.

² ἐκ τοιαύτης ἀρα ἀρχῆς ἡρτηται ἡ φύσις. Metaph. xiv. 7.

³ Ἐν μὲν ἀρα καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἀριθμῷ τὸ πρῶτον κινεῖται ἀκίνητον ἔν. Metaph. xiv. 8.

⁴ Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. ii. c. 5. 6.

unumquemque accurate inquirentem unde deductus sit rerum omnium ordo, postremo perventurum esse ad μονάδα: hanc vero μονάδα unum significasse Deum credimus, Laërtio et Plutarcho testibus, qui in sententiis veterum persequendis, multum operæ ponere solebant: his etiam consentit Velleius, dicens Pythagoram putavisse Deum esse "animum per naturam rerum intentum et comitantem."

Jam cum oratio lapsa fuerit ad hanc à Pythagora usurpatam similitudinem, liceat paucas modo ejusdem generis adferre, quibus scilicet alii utebantur Philosophi, ad eandem rem illustrandam. Stoici "mundum gymnasio similem voluerunt, ubi cum cernatur omnium rerum ratio, intelligitur esse aliquem rectorem, moderatorem, et tanquam architectum, qui præsitet et cui pareatur."¹ Apertius adhuc loquitur Aristoteles, ingenti similitudinum turba usus, e diversis petita locis, et in hoc tantummodo consentiente inter se, ut unius præpotentis Dei imaginem animo præbeant: ut enim, ita disserit, navi gubernator, ut currui auriga, ut choro præsul, ut civitati lex, ut exercitui dux, ita mundo Deus imperat.

Hic vero recenseamus oportet quæ dicta sunt, ut magis pateat quid adhuc effectum fuerit, et quantum profecti simus ad id quod quæritur cognoscendum. Hactenus ergo commonstratum videtur, nihil prorsus impedire quo minus credatur, eruditiores antiquorum ad unum numen agnoscendum pervenire potuisse, natura nimirum monstrante iter, et aliquid porro afferente luminis disciplina a majoribus qualicumque tradita: deinde eorum scripta aggressis, ex illustrioribus quibusque aliqua adferre in promptu erat, breviora certe illa quam pro rei amplitudine, sed satis firma ad docendum veteres Philosophos pluribus in locis, de uno Deo omnipotenti atque infinito, fuisse dilucide locutos. Quæ cum ita sint, jure optimo flagitemus quam ob causam ita locuti sint, nisi id ipsis vere persuasum fuisset? Nihil enim afferunt unde crêdatur, eos id fecisse quo facilius adirent potentiam, divitias, auctoritatem, decus, cum contra eo magis periculis olim implicitus quisque fuerit, quo ad veritatem de uno Deo propius accesserit: hinc Anaxagoræ² vincula, hinc Socratis cædes, hinc nostræ etiam sanctissimæ religionis ratio,³ crimen impietatis subiit, ut-

¹ Cic. de Nat. Deor.

² Plut. In Vit. Nic.

³ ἢ τις ἀθεός ἢ Χριστιανός ἢ Ἐπικουρίστος ἔσται, φησὶν Ἰω. Lucianus Pseudomantis.

pote quæ gentibus novam normam inferret, unius colendi numinis.

Talia autem interroganti qui desiderant quid respondeatur, nos fortasse vicissim urgeant, percontantes, quid sit cur eruditiores antiquorum adeo multos Deos toties nominaverint, nisi Polytheismus apud eos valuerit: ubique enim si hortandi sint cives ne privatis aut publicis officiis desint, non Dei, sed deorum timor incutitur: si jungenda sit amicitia, si ferendæ leges, si sancienda fœdera, si denique acuenda sit mens amore virtutis, aut e pravitate morum avocanda, ad Deos confugitur, eosque pene innumerabiles, et, prout occasio rem variaverit, ingenio ac potestate diversos.

Hæc verissima esse nemo prorsus ignorat: quæ cum videantur aliquantum cum antedictis pugnare, nos totos in præteritas ætates memoria rejiciamus necesse est, et rem aperiamus ab alta origine repetitam. Id quod non adeo factu facile est: ut enim navigantibus nobis, quo longius e terra progrediamur, eo fit difficilius scilicet relinqui littoris accurate oculis metiri; ita de opinionibus veterum quæstione inita, quo longius recedatur ab iis quibus interfuerunt temporibus, eo magis verendum est, ne fallamur in earum natura, qualis ac quanta fuerit, dijudicanda. Nobis sane religio est dubitare, quin veri cultus Dei fuerit commissus primis hominibus: qui tamen cum obsolescere cœpisset, disciplina paulatim languescente, mortales eum facile transferebant ad id cujus beneficio assidue afficiebantur, et ad eos, quorum benevolentiam grata recordatione meminerint; hinc soli et sideribus honores habiti, hinc præstantissimus quisque, postquam e vita migravisset, numero Deorum est ascriptus. Verum ubi jam eo progressæ essent res humanæ, ut artes multimodæ excolerentur, orti sunt poætæ, qui otio languentibus admoverent stimulos, aut labore defatigatos mulcerent. Hi, si Herodotum audiamus, primi in Græciam intulerunt Deorum cultus, et cum in tales offenderint de mortuis hominibus opiniones jam pridem usu receptas, quis tam cæcus est ut non cernat eos id ante omnia curaturos fore, ut populo morem gerant, varias nempe fingendo adornandoque plurimum Deorum fabulas? Hac enim via consuleretur optime suorum carminum venustati; cui quidem plurimum obsuisset veri cultus nuda simplicitas, ubi Deorum præliis, amoribus, aliisque multis traductis ad similitudinem humanæ imbecillitatis, nullus omnino locus relinqueretur. Attamen nisi brevitati

scrviendum esset, et longius vagari oratio timeret, facile comprobari posset apud ipsos poëtas, et præcipue apud Homerum,¹ crebram fieri mentionem supremi unius numinis, alios Deos suo nutu cohibentis, et rerum humanarum saluti suo arbitrio prospicientis.

Hos autem secuti sunt speculatores et venatores naturæ, qui Physicorum prudentiæ studebant, et res diligenter observatas, aut utiliter inventas, figuris et ἀλληγορίαις solebant adumbrare: unde orta est tandem infinita Deorum multitudo, et mythologia, quam vocant, fabulosæ levitatis plena.

Alia vero ex parte, iis qui ad republicas capessendas accederent, operæ pretium erat quam plurimos Deos populo² colendos proferre, tum declarare, virtutis acuendæ causa, qui erga civitatem officiis optime perfuncti essent, eos post mortem Deos esse: quo nihil dici potest aut fingi quod civibus magis suadeat ne facultatibus aut liberis nimis parcant, utque et labores et pericula, mortem denique ipsam, libenter obeant. Quod si aliquando plebs se commoveret liberius quam ut imperii meminerit, festiva alicujus numinis adhibita pompa, facile his artibus deliniri se passus est popularis animus, et in nova studia abierunt furores vulgi.

Quæ cum ita sint, non est profecto cur miremur Philosophorum inconstantiam, quum inducerent multitudinem pene infinitam Deorum in eas orationes quas coram concione habuerint. Quum vero idem etiam in iis quas ἰσωτερικὰς vocamus videatur fieri, locum hunc sane haud penitus exploratum aliquis putet, nisi de his Diis quoque, quales fuerint, quæstionem paulo accuratiorem instituamus.

Visum est igitur ex antedictis, Platonem, de origine mundi disserentem, Unum agnovisse Deum: sed simul ac lapsa sit oratio ad populares Deos, Junonem scilicet, Saturnum, Jovemque: diserte innuit idem parum ea sibi ipsi esse persuasa, quæ de his tradidisset antiquitas: rem vero majorem esse plane confitetur³ quam ut suum ingenium ad eam explicandam valeat: confitetur ea quæ e veteribus

¹ Il. ε. 18.

² Cic. de Leg. lib. ii. 7.

³ Plat. in Tim. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δαιμόνων εἰπεῖν, καὶ γινῶναι τὴν γένεσιν, μείζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς πιστόν δι' τοὺς εἰρηκότιν ἐμπροσθεν, ἐκγόνοις μὲν θεῶν οὖσιν, ὡς ἴσασαν, σαφῶς δὲ πάλαι τοῦς αὐτῶν προγόνους εἰδόναι· ἀδύνατον οὖν θεῶν παῖσιν ἀπιστεῖν, καίπερ ἄντι τοῖς ἰσώτοις καὶ ἀναγκαῖων ἀποδείξεων λέγουσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς οἰκία φάσκουσιν, φπαγγίλλειν, ἠτοιμάσας τῇ νόμῳ πιστευτόν.

dicta essent, argumentis haudquaquam probabilibus, nedum certis, inniti: his tamen, quippe quæ legibus sanciantur ac consuetudine, fidem eousque præstandam esse, judicat, ut quicquid in actione situm est, in eo decretis publicis obtemperetur: quod quidem etsi magni intersit ad tuendam tranquillitatem civitatis, tacitæ tamen secretioris animi sententiæ rationi unicæ parent: legibus parere neque solent neque possunt.

His igitur relictis Plato tamen multa est in varietate et copia, pluribus inductis Diis quibus in orbe moliendo moderandoque, variæ tribuuntur partes. Studiosè tamen inquirentibus quales sint hoc dignati nomine, patet eos esse supremi regis satellites quasi ac ministros, quibus utitur ad mandata sua exequenda: θεῶν enim nomen aëri, igni, aquæ, pariter assignatur, aliis etiam quibuscunque naturæ partibus, quæ constantes cursus¹ aut vim quandam ordinatam, ratosque effectus habeant.

Jam vero Stoicorum plures Deos e diversa omnino ratione fluxisse credibile est: eos enim apud Ciceronem invenimus spernentes ac repudiantes istam Deorum multitudinem, sive ex Physica disciplina deductam, sive a poetis confictam ad augendas carminum venustates; et Deum unum ponentes "pertinere per naturam cujusque rei, per terram Cererem, per maria Neptunum, aliosque per alia."² Quemadmodum enim Oceanus, unus cum sit, diversis appellatur nominibus, prout diversas præterlabatur regiones; ita Stoici unum Deum pluribus nuncupabant nominibus, prout eum cernerent diversis fungentem muneribus, aut varias ac multiplices humano generi utilitates adferentem.

Vidimus itaque quantulis rebus ac qualibus eruditiores antiquorum nomen Dei imposuerint, et quam vim huic vocabulo ipsi subjectam voluerint: sed cum eosdem pariter constet sæpissime locutos fuisse de supremo uno ac præpotenti numine, jure quodam arrepturi videmur, societatem istam Deorum, qualem initio statuerimus, iis nequaquam placuisse. Neque nobis ita dissèrentibus satis firme occurratur, ab iis qui in suam partem trahunt, sive Deos minores, sive Lares, quorum numero ascribi potest ille Socratis δαίμων, et frequens ille apud poëtas

Genius natale comes qui temperat astrum.

¹ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν. Plat. in Cratyl.

² Cic. de Nat. Deor.

Antiquitatem sane his fidem et cultum adhibuisse non inviti concedimus: neque tamen, hoc concesso, licet illico veteres Polytheismi arguere: multi enim divinioris sapientiæ alumni, non dubitant quin confiteantur esse in hac re aliquam veri adumbratam similitudinem. Qua sublata opinione, cogitatio satis jucunda, et virtus etiam ipsa tollatur necesse est: quid enim magis utile ad bene vivendum, quam opinari esse qui nos semper comitetur, videat, tueatur? ubi autem locus constantiæ relinquitur, nisi esset cui resisti oporteat, ubi vigilantiae, nisi esset qui insidias pararet? aut quid opus est præceptis, nisi sit qui nos ab officiis abducere conetur?

Si vero sint qui alia flagitant quibus firmari possunt quæ de antiquitate diximus, ad sacrosanctas literas accedamus, illo duce qui, cum mirum ad modum a Deo ipso delectus esset, ad veri cultus normam gentibus inducendam, tum etiam optime erat, si quis alius, in veterum scriptis versatus. Qui, Ecclesiam illam Romæ olim conditam hortatus, ut in fide Christiana se contineret, acerrime item in Philosophos invehatur;¹ eos profecto non ignorantiae insimulans quæ irretitos tenuerit, non imbecillitatis quæ vetuerit ne ad veritatem inveniendam animos satis erigerent, sed pravæ omnino voluntatis, malique animi, quod veritatem jam inventam palam proferre noluerint. Nihil ad hanc rem disertius excogitari potest, quam quæ pia olim sanctissimi apostoli indignatio de his ediderit: at jure aliquis requirat quem locum tantæ criminationi habuisset, nisi ex Philosophorum scriptis liquido appareret satis eos Unum Deum cognovisse, at cognitum de industria celasse?

J. B. OTTLEY, -

B COLL. ORIEL.

¹ Rom. i. 20, 21, 24.

REPLY OF ΒΟΙΝΤΟΣ TO E. H. BARKER.

I AM obliged to your learned correspondent for his complimentary expressions toward me. My observations on his criticism will be short.

With regard to the quotation from Ovid, I had discovered its filiation previous to the appearance of Mr. Barker's paper. I am nevertheless obliged to him for his reference, as well as for his recommendation of the French compilation. The usage which I was at one time disposed to condemn as a barbarism, was not, as your correspondent supposes, the employment of "pudet" in conjunction with "nobis," but the subjoining "nobis," a dative, to "dici." I allow, however, that my objection was unimportant.

On the second point, the orthography of the words *silva* and *solennis*, one and the same reply will suffice. I had no intention to condemn either *sylva* or *solemnis* as in itself a corruptoin, but to suggest that the preference given to these readings by certain editors, even supposing the readings themselves to be correct, might arise from erroneous causes. In the case of *Thybris*, although aware of the Greek usage *θύμβρις*, I was ignorant that any ancient Latin writer had employed this orthography. Does your correspondent mean to imply that this usage is to be found among any except moderns?

I may add, with respect to *silva*, that I am inclined to coincide with the orthography of your correspondent. My authority, however, is of little weight in the scale :

Non adeo ventum est, ut non, si voce Metelli
Servantur leges, malint a Cæsare tolli.

I thank Mr. Barker for his promised researches on the subject of Casimir.

I shall take the present opportunity of requesting any of your learned contributors who may be able to solve the enigma, to inform me what "Eubulus" means by "twisting monostrophics into choruses and dochmiacs?" My difficulty of comprehension may be owing to that *ἀνασθησία* so characteristic of the Bæotian people; till, however, some Œdipus arises to explain the marvel, all I can do is to parallel it with Lord Hervey's celebrated line, in which he speaks of

— Sapphic, Lyric, and Iambic odes :

on which Pope in his letter to Lord H. observes, "Your Lordship might as well desire your best friend, your tailor, to make you a coat, a suit of clothes, and a pair of breeches."

ΒΟΙΝΤΟΣ.

NOTICE OF

*The Three Pamphlets lately published, relative to the
Studies and Examinations at Cambridge.*

A CONSIDERABLE degree of interest has lately been excited in the University of Cambridge, by the renewed discussion of a subject on which opinions will most probably continue to be divided. It has long been a favorite scheme with several leading members of this learned body to effect new regulations in regard to the public general examination, and to require a proficiency in other branches of knowledge, besides that of mathematics, preparatory to a degree. This discussion has lately given rise to three pamphlets: the first entitled

“Thoughts on the present system of Academic Education in the University of Cambridge. By Eubulus.”

The second, “A Letter to the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Bristol, respecting an additional examination of students in the University of Cambridge, and the different plans proposed for that purpose. By Philoquantus.” This pamphlet concludes with a Postscript, in answer to the insinuations of Eubulus at the expense of the University of Cambridge.

The third, “A Letter to Philoquantus, by Eubulus, being a sequel to a pamphlet entitled ‘Thoughts, &c.’”

Although there is much asperity towards each other expressed by Eubulus and Philoquantus, yet their main object is the same, the adoption of an improved system of academical education, and the establishing an order of merit among those students who shall distinguish themselves in a theological and classical examination. Philoquantus has advocated his cause most ably and judiciously, and combated the objections of those who are opposed to it, with infinite spirit and effect. Eubulus displays equal zeal, but less judgment; and has laid himself open to the deserved animadversions of the former by the indiscreet manner in which he has thrown down the gauntlet. “It gives me some concern,” says Philoquantus, “to find desirable measures recommended by a writer who reasons like Eubulus.” We agree with him, for it is impossible that any man can serve his party, who argues so loosely, or is so much abroad in his statements, as Eubulus. Nothing can be more hasty than the mode in which

he has got up his pamphlet, nor more unguarded than his expressions, nor more illogical than his reasoning. It is a grave and momentous question upon which he writes; but how does he meet it? Most unworthily of himself (for Eubulus could have done better) and of his subject, by vague assertions, untenable positions, random charges, and unscholarlike presumptions. A writer, who proposes to change a system which has been consecrated by the success of many years, and by the approbation of some of the first characters in the university, and which, with all its real or imaginary defects, has contributed most largely to the scientific, literary, and intellectual improvement of the country, ought to proceed to the investigation with infinitely more care and reflection than Eubulus has shown. It employed a syndicate, appointed for the especial purpose, and composed of persons well qualified, and in full possession of the confidence of the university, many days of anxious consideration, before they could arrange any scheme of the same nature which Eubulus has in view, or digest a proposal deserving of being submitted to the senate: and yet he has had the courage to come hastily and abruptly to the same question, and supposes he has done justice to it in twenty scanty pages, which contain little more than a mere outline. The consequence is, that he has exposed himself to the suspicion of the real friends of the university; has called up an adversary from his own side; and has placed himself under the mortifying necessity of explaining away, or softening down, in a second pamphlet, the incautious language of the first. We cannot be pleased with finding the system of our Alma Mater treated with levity and apparent contempt, however we may desire to see it improved: and therefore we deeply regret, with Philo grantus, that we are obliged "*to notice the general weakness of a performance*, in which there are two or three sentences, respecting the pursuit of Christian knowledge, highly honorable to the writer."

Eubulus begins his pamphlet by professing a determination to pursue his subject with temper and moderation; without resenting, or retaliating, "if it should excite anger or asperity on the part of his antagonists." "Indeed," he says, "it is not very likely that I shall reply." He is, however, forced to reply to the strictures of Philo grantus, who could perceive no more "moderation or temper" in his observations on the university of Cambridge, than we can perceive in the letter which he has inscribed to the Dean of Peterborough. Philo grantus and the Dean may probably be the same; and we confess we discern much proof of resentment and retaliation, and none of temper or good taste, in

150 Notice of Eubulus and Philoquantus

the mottoes to his letter, which Eubulus evidently means to apply to the latter.

Eubulus has taken great pains to explain in his second publication what he meant to express in the first, and to remove the effects of erroneous construction;—but whatever his intentions were, it is impossible to read the following passages, without being impressed with the belief, that they contain a charge against the university, of paying *exclusive attention* to Mathematics.

“Why is the examination for degrees, why are the honors, and generally speaking the rewards and patronage, of the university, confined so *exclusively* to mathematical pursuits?” p. 4.

“No man can fairly accuse me of depreciating or undervaluing the importance of mathematical studies, although I may still make it a question why they should be so *exclusively* pursued.” p. 5.

“Suppose Mathematics not to be the *exclusive* branch of academic examination in this university, would there be any deficiency of great and eminent mathematicians?—The same stimulus, which was *then* sufficient to produce a Newton, would always operate to produce one, although there were no exclusive preference given to mathematics, and no exclusive rewards.” p. 11.

“This exclusive preference militates against the very spirit of our institution.” p. 12.

Eubulus argues, that his words “*university examination,*” and “*examination for degrees,*” ought to be a salvo against any misconstruction—but we think, that the repetition and emphatic use of the word *exclusive*, and the sentence “*why are the honors, and generally speaking the rewards and patronage, of the university, confined so exclusively to mathematical pursuits,*” are quite enough to warrant any reader, who is imperfectly acquainted with the institutions of the university, in forming the conclusion, that there are no rewards and no distinctions at Cambridge for classical merit, and therefore but little competition or emulation in this department. It so happens, that there is not an academical body in the world where patronage and honors excite young men to more emulation in literary pursuits, than at this university; and Philoquantus has most forcibly and adroitly turned this fact into an argument, why the measure, which Eubulus mars by his indiscretion, should be carried into execution. “Our university examinations for Chancellor’s medals, and university scholarships, have, I readily confess, a powerful influence in promoting the study of the classics. Such is the zeal and industry which they generate, that, as your Lordship, who has long been an examiner on these occasions, will testify, it is not unfrequent

to find students of less than three years' standing, who exhibit a familiarity with the greater part of the Greek and Latin writers of the purest ages: who, in their imitations of the poets in both languages, performed within three or four hours, show spirit, taste, and correctness which would deserve praise, were they the productions of long time and study; and who add to these acquirements a very extensive knowledge in history, antiquities, chronology, grammar, and philology; and sometimes answer satisfactorily to almost every description of questions on these subjects that can reasonably be put to a student. Both the benefit to the individuals and the credit resulting to the university are great: but then the benefit extends only to eight or ten persons at the utmost, belonging to each year, who are stimulated to exertion by the influence of these prizes. Of the effect which is certain to ensue from the proposed liberal and unlimited competition, we have already a strong illustration at the contests for our university scholarships; here the examiners occasionally mention with honor some able scholars who come next to the successful candidate; and it is well known that many young men prepare themselves long and industriously for this trial, without cherishing any hopes of the prize itself, but aspiring only to that uncertain and unrecorded honor;

Tantus amor laudum, tantæ est victoria curæ.

What would be the effect upon the generous ambition and ingenious minds of the youths, were appropriate rewards offered to every gradation of real merit!" p. 32—

We heartily wish with Philo that this fine spirit of emulation were more encouraged than it is, that a proper balance were observed, and that all the honors of the university were conferred with reference to the collective merits of the candidates, estimated by a joint examination of their mathematical and classical attainments: "the motive for additional industry would then," as he observes, "become general, and instead of being confined to those of superior pretensions from talent, it would operate upon all gradations of ability." But while such a spirit, and to such an extent, does exist, it cannot be said that the university neglects the study of the classics, nor, considering the value of the prizes and rewards which are annually assigned to classical merit, can it fairly be complained that "generally speaking its rewards and patronage are *exclusively* confined to mathematical pursuits." The yearly amount of public prizes and scholarships for the encouragement of classical and elegant literature, and which are open to the whole university, may be calculated at upwards of nine hundred and fifty pounds, while those of the different col-

leges have been estimated at two hundred pounds. The effects of these rewards and distinctions will be better understood, if we name a few of the living scholars who not only confer lustre on their country in general, but whose learned and editorial labors sufficiently prove with what assiduity they must have cultivated the Muses under the auspices of the university.—Butler, Maltby, Dobree, Blomfield, Monk, Barker, Burges, and Bailey, are characters well known by their literary researches; whose works will attest the classical reputation of Cambridge, long after the pamphlets of Eubulus shall be totally forgotten.

Eubulus is so persuaded of the general inutility of Cambridge education, that he asks, "What are the remaining 94, the average number annually of those who receive no academic honors? What have they to show for an education of three years and a quarter, at an expense which cannot be short of £700? What have they got in religion, ethics, metaphysics, history, classics, jurisprudence?" p. 5.

The question is unfairly put, as though the university gave them no opportunity of showing any thing for their £700; for it should be remembered, that even at a school, and much less at a university, young men cannot be *compelled* to become proficient, or to turn to account the advantages which are offered them. The question should be, what *might* they have got? and to this we could answer—they might have acquired taste, information, and intelligence; they had admission to valuable libraries, they had access to manuscripts as well as books, they had the assistance of able tutors who would have directed their reading, and corrected their judgment; or, if poring over books did not suit their health or inclination, they had an easier path to knowledge, which they might have followed: they might have attended the various lectures on modern history, on civil law, and the laws of England, on geology, mineralogy, or political economy, either of which are known to furnish entertainment as well as instruction. But Eubulus is not the first to ask whether students have become wiser or better, and what attainments they have gathered at public institutions, expecting to be answered in the negative. It would, however, be a very hard thing for schools and universities, if the idle and the profligate, if those who *will not* learn or improve, are to constitute the standard by which their utility is to be estimated. "They who urge," says Philoquantus, "that we ought to look to the instructions of the tutors, as the means of supplying every deficiency of our public system, really expect these gentlemen to accomplish impossibilities. From them the undergraduate receives advice and direction in his studies, assist-



ance in his difficulties, and encouragement to exertion and perseverance; from their lectures he derives information relative to the subjects which he is studying, and is daily called upon to exhibit some results of his industry. But when a young man chooses to follow the seductions of pleasure or of indolence, rather than the exhortations of his instructor, what can the mere lectures effect? Regular attendance on these occasions may, it is true, be enforced: but what is the advantage, generally speaking, of sitting for an hour to hear a lecture on a subject, which has not employed a single minute of previous attention? It is principally to the studious part of his pupils that the duty of a tutor requires him to adapt his lectures: and though he takes all occasions in his power to give encouragement and assistance to those who have neglected their previous opportunities, yet it cannot be expected that the deserving and industrious should be kept back in their progress, in order to accommodate their indolent or incapable contemporaries." p. 9—10.

We do not, however, concede to Eubulus, that all those who take no honors, are *non-reading men*, "and have acquired nothing in religion, classics, history, &c." On the contrary we know that there are many, whose names do not appear in the Triposes, or among the prize-men, but who, after remaining *undistinguished* in their academic career, carry into life a large share of the solid advantages of an academic education, and become *distinguished* members of society.

In the sixth and seventh pages of his pamphlet, Eubulus has proposed nine questions, the *jet* of which seems to be, that much benefit is not experienced from mathematical attainments, beyond the walls of the university. To one of these, "*Of what use to them are their mathematics in common life?*" he shall give the answer himself. "Mathematics," says he, in page 4, "are no doubt a high and important branch of study. They are a science closely concerned in the investigation of abstract truth, requiring intensity of attention, accuracy of research, acuteness of application, and severity of judgment: they are intimately connected with the most useful arts, and with the sublimest speculations; with those inventions which give man power over the world in which he is placed, and with those discoveries which elevate him to the knowledge and contemplation of the worlds beyond and around him."

For an answer to two more of his questions, we will refer Eubulus to the Cambridge Calendar. "Is it true," he asks; "that they, generally speaking, turn their mathematics to any account, except that of speculative amusement, or academic

154 Notice of *Eubulus* and *Philograntus*

contention? They may be, and no doubt they often are, very ingenious and acute men; but does that ingenuity and acuteness for the most part *tell* to any great moral, or political, or social purpose? If *Eubulus* will turn to the *Tripodes*, and read the notes under the list of those who have obtained mathematical distinction, he will discover a constellation of great names, whose brilliancy is not merely shed from the *orbs* of academic glory, but which has enlightened the walks of active life, and shone with unclouded brightness amidst the literati, churchmen, and statesmen of the day. He will perceive that there is not a department in literature, science, or politics, in which the *wranglers* and *senior optimés* of Cambridge have not held a distinguished place, and that their ingenuity and acuteness have constantly been telling to "every great moral, political, and social purpose." We have counted the names recorded in the *Calendar* of no less than ninety-three eminent characters, who have carried their mathematical acquirements into "common life," and brought them to bear upon those elegant or useful pursuits, by which they have risen to the highest honors in the church, and in the senate, at the bar, and at the shrine of literary fame. Mr. Pitt was frequently heard to say, that if he had any advantage over his great rival, Mr. Fox, he was indebted for it to his mathematical studies: and it is impossible to observe the luminous and argumentative style in which such men as Bishops Marsh and Middleton deliver themselves in the pulpit, and Copley and Tindal at the bar, or to read the substantial and pithy sentences of Paley and Malthus, without perceiving how much they owe to those metaphysical and philosophical branches of knowledge, which bend the mind to habits of rigid demonstration. We have often heard quoted Gibbon's silly opinion, as to the injury which mathematical pursuits may do to what are called the finer feelings of moral evidence; and the sentiment has been carried still farther by persons, who would persuade us that a first-rate mathematician, can never be an elegant scholar. We will refer to the *Cambridge Calendar* again; and the fact of 36 classical medals having been awarded to men who ranked among the *four first wranglers*, will be a convincing proof that great philosophical and literary attainments are not incompatible.

To return to *Eubulus*—whose partiality for that little crooked thing, a note of interrogation, again leads him to enquire, "*Are not the Cambridge mathematics almost exclusively speculative?*"—"What is the greater part of that examination, but a set of mathematical conundrums?"—"What will future

ages say of our own? *We have even deserted the track of geometry, and forsaken the path our mighty master trod.*" We must answer question by question. Does Eubulus, when he accuses the university of neglecting the practice for the theory, forget the public lectures of the Plumian professor, where all the fundamental propositions in experimental philosophy, in mechanics, hydrostatics, optics, and astronomy, are proved with the assistance of the necessary instruments and machinery? Does he forget the lectures of the Jacksonian professor, in which the application of the principles of natural philosophy, natural history, and chemistry, to the arts, manufactures, and agriculture, of the country, presents so useful a field of instruction? Is he to be reminded that the labors and discoveries of Newton are so far from being neglected, that his chair is now filled by the person most qualified, and most inclined, to tread in his steps? The present Lucasian professor well deserves the compliment which Philoquantus has paid him, and there is not a Cambridge man who will not thank us for transcribing it. "The late appointment of Professor Turton, to fill the chair of our immortal philosopher, while it affords the utmost satisfaction to all friends of the university, gives us a security, that the philosophical studies of our youth will receive the most judicious and useful direction."

As to the conundrums, and new fashion of mathematics, of which Eubulus affects to complain, the last senate-house examination will satisfy every candid enquirer, that the Newtonian branch of the science still occupies its proud and pre-eminent station; and out of 144 questions which are inserted in the Calendar of 1821, 49 only can be considered as Analytical, or bearing upon the French system, while all the rest belong most decidedly to "the closeness of geometrical investigation." So much for his lamentation over "new refinements, new quirks, and new capriccios of ingenuity!"

Eubulus is determined to be in arms, and after having broken a lance against Mathesis, the monster of Cambridge, he most valiantly puts a fresh spear in the rest, and rides in tilt with the Muse: but here he is completely unhorsed. "*Our range of Greek reading,*" says he, "*is at present too much confined. We labor about the dramatic writers too much, to the exclusion of the rest. We must not forsake the critics, philosophers, orators, and historians of Greece, for a mere branch of her poets.*" Let us see if he has applied the terms *exclusion* and *forsake*, better than he did before; and for this purpose we will consult some of the examination papers which we have by us,

156 *Notice of Eubulus and Philoquantus*

and they shall tell whether the dramatists occupy an undue share of attention or not. The following are the subjects of a miscellaneous collection, which happened to fall into our hands; and when we present it to our readers, we declare that the papers have not been selected to answer the present purpose, and that they are all we are able to refer to at this moment.

Trinity College, June 1817.

Œdipus Tyrannus.

Trinity College, 1818.

Philoctetes.

Trinity College, 1819.

Æschyli Persæ.

St. John's College, 1819.

Prometheus.

Trinity College, 1820.

Iliad. G. 7. 8.

Trinity College, 1816.

Questions relating to St. Luke.

Trinity College, 1818.

Thucydides, lib. 2.

St. John's College, June 1818.

Demosthenes de Corona.

St. John's College, June 1819.

Questions on St. Luke.

St. John's College, Dec. 1819.

Xenophon. Anabasis. lib. 8.

St. John's College, May 1820.

Acts of the Apostles.

St. John's College, June 1820.

St. Luke's Gospel.

Trinity College, 1820.

Questions on Thucydides, lib. 3.

St. John's College, June 1820.

Thucydides.

Of the only two university scholarship papers, which we happen to have in our possession, the first requires a passage from Sophocles to be translated into English prose, and Latin Alcaics, and a passage from Homer to be translated into English prose. The second proposes five questions relating to Greek literature: of these the two first bear upon passages in Herodotus, and on geographical and mythological subjects. The third enquires, what were the principal dialects in Greece, and their chief distinctions? The fourth relates to the metrical rules, and peculiar niceties observable in the Greek Tragedians; and the fifth, to the Greek year, and the different cycles that were introduced at different periods. Let it be granted that these specimens of classical examination papers are fairly produced, and they will justify the assertion of Philoquantus, that the study of the poets and the prose authors is equally encouraged. But Eubulus returns to the charge in the sequel to his pamphlet, and triumphantly asks, "From the year 1800 to the present time, has any thing issued from the University press in Greek literature, but Greek plays?" It is very true,

the Greek drama has been the principal object of the learned Editors, whom Eubulus names—but wherefore? Because this branch of literature requires more attention, and more investigation than any other. False readings in Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, or Xenophon, are much more rare, and of less importance than in the dramatists; and even if they were more numerous than they are, a second-rate scholar might easily detect and correct them; whereas it demands a vast fund of learning, an unusual degree of critical acumen, and a most vigorous intellect, to eradicate the errors which have crept into the Greek plays. In a dramatic author, where the sense is often embarrassed, even without a mistake in punctuation or orthography, the wrong position of a word, or of so much as a single letter, is known to entangle not only a sentence, but a whole passage. Conjectural emendations, philological criticisms, judicious substitutions, and happy illustrations, are therefore more necessary, and consequently more highly prized in this, than in any other department of letters: and, as our own poet Shakespeare has been permitted to furnish more work for editors and commentators than all our historians and philosophers, so we must allow Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, to engross a larger share of the scholar's notice, than the historians or philosophers of Greece. In fact we should be obliged to those eminent critics, who have gone so deeply into the troubled waters of metrical confusion, and restored order to the perplexity of choral mazes, instead of carping at them, for devoting their time to such weary researches.

We are as anxious as Eubulus can possibly be, that the mighty names which grace the historic and philosophic page of Grecian literature, should not be forgotten in our admiration of her drama; but we most earnestly hope the time will never come when the university shall cease to pay that attention to the muses which she now gives.

The ancient languages of Greece and Rome can never be properly understood without a thorough knowledge of prosody; and pure classical taste depends as much upon a familiarity with the dramatic, as with the heroic, lyric, or pastoral writers: nor is it too much to say, that livelier recollections of history, and mythology, and a better idea of national manners, are impressed on the memory by a few lines of a Greek or Latin poet, than by as many pages of a prose author. It is therefore quite preposterous to suppose that a person can become a sound or elegant scholar, but by an intimate acquaintance with the poets of the language which is to be his study. As it is poetry

which forms the connecting link, "with its little documents," between the ages that are, and those that are gone; which gives immortality to a decayed nation, consecrates its ancient glory, and breathes a romantic charm over the soil and climate, the landscapes and scenery, which are associated with its history; so it is a love of the muses which refines the taste, cherishes genius, and inspires that literary enthusiasm which leads to scholastic eminence.

E. H. BARKERI AMŒNITATES CRITICÆ ET PHILOGICÆ.

PARS. III.—[Continued from No. XXXII. p. 378.]

1. PROFESSOR Dunbar having, in the last No. of the *Class. Journ.* (L. 219.), recalled the attention of scholars to Dr. Blomfield's observations on adverbs ending in *ē* and *ī*, which appear in the Gloss. ad Æsch. Pr. 208., and to his own remarks on those obs., which are in the 25th No. of the *Class. Journ.*, I shall lay before both of them, and before the readers of this periodical work in general, the opinion of Professor Sturz, contained in a tract, of which their learned author has kindly presented me with a copy, and which is perhaps unknown both to Professor Dunbar and to Dr. Blomfield:—"Quinque Orationes a totidem Scholæ Regiæ Discipulis A. D. xiv. Sept. A. C. 1814. habendas indicturus de *Nonnullis Dionis Cassii Locis* tertium disputavit M. Fr. Guil. Sturz, ill. Mold. Rector et Prof., Grimæ, ex Officina Goeschenia."

DE ADVV. DESINENTIBUS IN *ē* ET *ī*.

"Exponenda nonnulla existimo de adverbis in *ē* et *ī* desinentibus, et ap. Dion. frequentissimis, quippe quorum terminationes nulli legi putantur aut subjeetæ esse, aut subjiciendæ. Ita judicant Interpretes Pollucis vi, 162. ix, 10. 143. alique, ut Alberti ad Hes. v. *Ἀνατ.* E recentissimis Grammaticis audiamus Ph. Butmanni sententiam, Griech. Grammatik p. 427. sq. Ed. 6. Berol. 1811, 8°. i:—

'Diese zwiefache Aussprache bestimmte der Wohlklang und vielleicht bei Dichtern das Metrum (da *ī* auch kurz gebraucht

werden kann); in unsern Ausgaben die Handschriften oder die Menge der Beispiele, (*Exempla multa habet Fischer. Specim. i, 74. 298. sq.*) Diese bezeichnen einen mit der Handlung, welche den Satz ausdrückt, verbundenen Umstand. Die Verbalia insbesondere gehen aus auf *τί* oder *τε*, welche Endungen ganz nach Art der Endung auf *τός* angehängt werden, z. B. *ὀνομαστὶ, ἐργηγορτὶ*, besonders in Zusammensetzung mit der Verneinung und andern Begriffen, z. B. *ἀγελαστὶ, ἀνιδρωτὶ, ἀκηρυκτε*.—Die von Nominibus gebildeten haben blos *ί* oder *ει* an der Stelle der Declinir Endung (so dass also das *τ* zum Stamm gehört in *έκοντὶ, ἀνατε*.) Die meisten sind Composita, z. B. *πανδημεῖ, αὐτονοχεῖ* (von einer alten Flexion, *νῦξ, νυχὸς*;) *ἀμαχεῖ, αὐτοχειρὶ, νηποινί*.

“Mihi vero, quod pace viri eruditissimi dixerim, hæc non probari fateor. Nam vera quidem sunt, quæ attulit, omnia, si nihil nisi quærimus, quid sit. Sed nullo modo mens et ratio humana ita temere, sine lege omni ac norma, in lingua formanda versari existimanda est, videndum potius, quas causas ea verisimiliter sit in quoque genere secuta. Quod igitur ad adverbia illa attinet, periculum facere animus est, num possint leges reperiri, ad quarum normam Græci alia adverbia in *ι*, alia in *ει*, alia utroque modo terminaverint. Scilicet quemadmodum adverbia in *α* vel *η* exeuntia revera nihil sunt nisi ablativi, sive, ut vulgo vocantur, dativi, nominum, ut *βία, κρύφα, λάθρα, δημοσία, πανοικησία, πανστρατιά, παρρησία, κομιδῇ, κρυφῇ, πεζῇ, σπουδῇ, σχολῇ*: ita etiam, quæ in *ι* vel *ει* terminantur, ut *έκοντὶ, άμυστὶ*, (a nom. *άμυστις*;) *έθελοντὶ, έκοντὶ, αὐτοετὲι, ήρεμεῖ*. In *ει* igitur exeunt, quæcunque originem debent nominibus in *ειον* desinentibus, ut *άθειε* a nom. *θειον*, aut iis, a quibus verba in *αω* et *εω* et *εύω*, vel adjectiva in *ης* descendunt, ut *αὐτοβοεῖ* (extat *αὐτοβόητος*), *αὐτονοχεῖ* (notum est *έννοχεύω*), *πανδημεῖ* (habemus *άποδημέω* et similia,) *πανομιλεῖ* (quis *όμιλέω* nescit?), *τριστοιχεῖ* (dicimus *στοιχεώ*), *αὐτοετὲι*, et *ήρεμεῖ*, qui, quod modo innui, proprie sunt dativi adjectivorum *αὐτοετής*, et *ήρεμῆς*, aut nominibus, quæ in syllaba ultima *η* habent, ut *άμαχεῖ* (male igitur ap. Dion. p. 114. 40. in Cod. Mediceo antiquiori scriptum extat *άμαχῖ*), *άνατεῖ, άσπουδεῖ, πανσυδεῖ*. Priora enim sunt a nominibus *μάχη, αἴτη, σπουδῇ*, ultimum a *σύδην*, qui revera est accusativus substantivi *σύδη*. In *ι* terminantur, quæ fiunt vel e dativis nominum tertiæ declinationis, ut *ένιδρωτὶ, αὐτανδρὶ, αὐτοποδὶ, αὐτοχειρὶ, παμπαιδὶ, παγγυναικὶ, πανθοινὶ*, vel e dativis nominum declinationis primæ, ut *άμετρὶ* pro *άμετρία*, *άνατὶ* (legitur hoc p. 164. 86. in Cod. Bavarico secundo, pro *άνατὶ*, quod in *άνατεῖ* mutandum esse e superioribus liquet,) *άπαρτὶ*, cum significat Plene, pro *άπαρτία, πανστρατὶ* e *πανστρεα-*

τιᾶ, vel quæ derivantur ab ejusmodi nominibus, quæ in syllaba ultima, aut a verbis, quæ in penultima, *ι* habent, ut ἀκονιτὶ, ἐγκονιτὶ, vel a nominibus in ὄν terminatis, ut ἀδακρυτὶ, τετραποδητὶ, vel ab adjectivis in ὄς exeuntibus, ut ἀκλαυτὶ, ἀκριτὶ, ἀμαχητὶ, ἀμεταστρεπτὶ, ἀναιμωτὶ (de quo v. Eustath. ad II. P. 497.) ἀναπνευστὶ, ἀνωϊστὶ, ἀνωμοτὶ, ἀπνευστὶ, ἀπονητὶ, ἀσκαρδαμυκτὶ, ἀφρικτὶ, ἀφοφητὶ, νηποινὶ, vel ab adverbis in ὡς desinentibus (de his et de iis, quæ proxime sequuntur, v. Draco Strat. de Metr. Poet. p. 37. et 96.) ut δημιωστὶ, ἱερωστὶ, μεγαλωστὶ, νεωστὶ, (nisi hoc est ab antiquo nom. νέως, cujus accusativus νέωτα superest. Ceterum Cod. Medic. Dionis p. 195 90. male dat νεωστει,) vel a verbis, quæ in ἴζω terminantur, ut Αἰγυπτιστὶ, ἀνδριστὶ, Ἀττικιστὶ, βαρβαριστὶ, βοϊστὶ, διαμελειστὶ, Δωριστὶ, δωροδοκιστὶ, Ἑλληνιστὶ, Θρακιστὶ, Ἰνδιστὶ, Λυδιστὶ, Μαιωτιστὶ, Μακεδονιστὶ, Παρθιστὶ, Περσιιστὶ, Ῥωμαϊστὶ, Σκυθιστὶ, τετραποδιστὶ, Φρυγιστὶ, vel a verbis in ἄζω desinentibus, ut ἀγελαστὶ, ἀστακτὶ, (de hoc et præcedente v. Valck. ad Theocr. x. Idyll. p. 225. Ed. Lug. B. 1810. 8. ubi reprobatur ἀστακτει non minus quam ἀγελαστει, et Wyttēb. ad Plat. Phædon. 331.) ἀστενακτὶ, Ἰαστὶ, ὀνομαστί. In universum et obiter hoc monere liceat, multas nominum formas nobis periisse, id quod e paucis vestigiis colligere possumus. Sic ἀλκὶ pro ἀλκῇ, λιτὶ pro λιτῷ, κλαδὶ pro κλάδω, ὕσμινι reperiuntur, quasi a nominativis ἀλξ, λῖς, κλάς, ὕσμιν, (omnino de talibus v. Fischer. l. I. Specim. ii, 182. sq. 186. sq.) Quid igitur impedit, quo minus αὐτανδρὶ et αὐτοποδὶ et similia statuamus revera esse antiquos dativos nominum αὐτανδρὶς et αὐτοποδὶς et reliquorum? Ex omnibus autem, quæ diximus, satis, opinor, apparet, cur nonnulla utroque modo scribi possint, ut πανσυδεὶ a σύδη, et πανσυδὶ a πανσυδία vel πανσυδὶς, ἀκμητὶ ab ἀκμητῆς, et ἀκμητὶ ab ἀκμητος, πανθοινεὶ a πανθοινέω, et πανθοινὶ a πανθοινία vel πανθοινὶς, et cur ἀκηρυκτὶ, ἀκλαυτὶ, ἀμισθὶ, αὐτοβοεὶ, rectius scribantur, quam ἀκηρυκτει, (quare in Dionis Fragm. cxliiii. extr. ἀκηρυκτὶ e Cod. Bavar. l. recipiendum est,) ἀκλαυτει, (quanquam enim Valck. l. I. k in Callim. H. in Dian. 267. ἀκλαυτει præfert, haud dubie quia metri ratio postulat, ut syllaba prima producatur, tamen hoc ejus judicium mihi displicet, tam propter analogiam, quam quia Dracq. l. I. diserte dicit, *ι* in ἀκλαυτὶ produci,) ἀμισθει, (unde ap. Dion. p. 681. 61. pro ἀμισθει reponendum arbitror ἀμισθὶ,) αὐτοβοεὶ, (p. 191. 47. et 228, 80. et sæpius Cod. Medic. antiquior male dat αὐτοβοῖ, sed αὐτοβοεὶ recte extat in permultis Dionis locis.) Ducta enim illa tria sunt ab abjectivis ἀκήρυκτος, ἀκλαυτος, et ἀμισθος, ultimum autem a v. βοάω." Hactenus Sturzius.

Insignis est nota Brunckii ad Apollon. R. 1, 1019.:—

"*Ἀυτονυχί*, sic B. C. D. Cæs. etiam Medic. et Guelferb. In E. *ἄυτονυχεί* primo scriptum fuerat, sed itidem correxit librarius. Hoc ex inutili circa metrum cautela natum. *ι* produceretur in cæsura, si necessario breve esset in hac adverbiorum forma; sed et alibi longum occurrit, ut in Soph. CEd. Col. 1646. *Εὐμ-παντες* *ἄστακτὶ* δὲ *σὺν ταῖς παρθένοις*, Aj. 1227. *Τλῆναι καθ' ἡμῶν ᾧδ' ἄνοιμωκτὶ χανεῖν*." Idem ad 4, 1130. :—"A. E. *αὐτονυχεί*. Vide notata ad 1, 1019. Ultima itidem producitur in *ἀναιμωτὶ*, 2, 986."

Addo notam viri eruditissimi quibique amicissimi, Hermanni, ad Soph. Aj. 1206. quem librum e dono editoris possideo :—"Ald. et Codd. nonnulli *ἄνοιμωκτεῖ*, quod receperunt Lobeck. et Erfurdt. Brunckius ex aliis Codd. et Eustath. 723, 28. *ἄνοιμωκτὶ*. Variæ de his adverbii sententiæ sunt virorum doctorum, Hemsterhusii ad J. Poll. 9, 143. Valck. Adoniaz. p. 228. Spanh. Callim. ad H. in Dian. 65. Lobeck. et Elmsleii ad Soph. versum, Blomfield. Gloss. ad Æsch. Pr. 216. Nondum tamen res ad liquidum perducta est. Illud quidem recte, opinor, statuemus, quæ a verbis fiant adverbia, in *ι* terminari, nunc breve, nunc longum. In his igitur est etiam *ἄνοιμωκτὶ*, non illud ab *ἄνοιμωκτος*, sed ab *οἰμῶζω* deductum."

The note of Lobeck is as follows :—" *Ἀνοιμωκτὶ* legitur in duobus Codd. Brunckii et ap. Eust. 723. Vulgo ante Brunck. *ἄνοιμωκτεῖ*, ut ap. Suid. *Ἀνοιμωκτεῖ* *ἄστενάκτως* : sed in prioribus Edd. *ἄνοιμωτὶ* legitur, ut ap. Zonar. 1, 226. *Ἀνοιμωκτὶ* *χωρὶς οἰμωγῆς*. 'Sic *ἄστακτὶ*,' inquit Brunck., 'ultimam producit in Soph. CEd. C. 1646. *ἄστενακτὶ* in Comici Concion. 464.' idemque inculcavit ad Apoll. Rh. 1, 1019. Nihilò secius vulgatam lectionem sub vexillo retinui; nam quod ait nihil ad metrum interesse, utrum hoc an illo modo scribatur, multo aliter est. Quippe hæc, *ἀναιμωτεῖ*, *ἄστακτεῖ* etc. ob eam ipsam causam a poetis usurpata sunt, quod ad numeros explendos erant uberiora. Quæ autem a substantivis ducuntur, dativorum sequuntur vicissitudines, ut *παμφαιδὶ*, *παγγυναικὶ*, *παμπληθεῖ*, *πανθενεῖ*, hisque consona sunt *ἀβουλεῖ*, *ἀσπαυδεῖ*, *πανομιλεῖ*, *ὀλορῶριζεῖ*, *αὐθωρεῖ* etc. *Πανδημὶ*, *πανοικὶ*, *πανορμὶ* librariorum menda sunt aut poetarum impeditiorum perfugia, ut quod paulo ante memorabam *πανδημὶ*, Nicarch. 3. Quæ Valck. Adoniaz. p. 228. T. H. ad J. Poll. 9, 143. Spanh. ad Callim. 2, 174. de hoc verborum genere tradiderunt, mendo non vacant. *Ἀμαχχτὶ* et similia illa Heyn. adeo ad Il. X. 182. vel ap. poetarum aliter scribi posse negat."

"V. 1227. *Ἀνοιμωκτὶ*, so Brunck, Botha, and Schäfer, with the consent of several Mss. and Eust. We prefer this orthography to the other form, *ἄνοιμωκτεῖ*, which Lobeck and Erfurdt

have recalled. The fullest and best account of these adverbs, which we have seen, is given by Dr. Blomfield in his note on *Æsch. Pr.* 208. "Ἦιοντ' ἀμοχθὶ πρὸς βίαν τε δεσπόσειν. To his enumeration may be added ἀνωμοσι, *Herod.* 2, 108. παγγενί, *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* 5, 21. and perhaps a few others. In the remains of the Attic poets we find, ἀνατὶ, ἀστενακτὶ, ἀστακτὶ, πανδημί, πανομιλί, ἀμοχθὶ, ἀκλητὶ, ἐγερτὶ, ἐσχυθιστὶ, Δωριστὶ, etc. The reader will observe that most of these words are of such a form, that the last syllable can hardly be necessarily long in a *senarius*, especially a tragic *senarius*. It would be difficult to construct a tragic *senarius*, in which the last syllable of ἀμοχθὶ, for example, could not be considered as short. This is the reason, why we find so few verses, which can be compared with that now before us." *Elmsley's Notes on Soph. Aj.*, in *Mus. Cr. Cant.* 4, 485.

2. DE PARTICULA Νη: DE ADJ. Νηδεής: DE ALCMAN. ET CALLIM. FRAGM.

"IN his Note on v. 248. Blomf. remarks, that νηλεῶς is by an aphæresis for ἀνηλεῶς, and that the particle νη, if we can place any confidence in him, ought to be banished intirely from Greece. This language may sound harsh to some of our readers: they must know, however, that this unfortunate particle, when used negatively, belongs to that class of words, which are called *Inseparable*, but which philologists conceive to have once existed in an independent state, as they form an essential part of some words, whose origin cannot otherwise be satisfactorily explained. We willingly agree, therefore, with Professor Dunbar in thinking that Mr. Blomf. should first have completely removed this difficulty, and accounted for the formation of those words, in which νη is generally thought to be an essential ingredient, while in many of them there is either no trace of α prefixed, or the signification is essentially different. Νήπιος, for instance, is compounded of νη and ἔπος, ἀνήπιος being unheard of; νῆστις of νη and ἔστις: ἀνηστις indeed occurs, but in this word, as well as in many others, there is as much reason to suppose the prefixed α to be privative, as pleonastic: νήπλεκτος, *Incomtus*; ἀναπλέκω, *Redimio*; νήποινος, (from νη and ποινή,) *Impunitus*: ἀνάποινος, (from α priv. and ἀποινα,) *Non pretio redemptus*: νημαρτής, (from νη and αμαρτάνω,) ἀναμαρτής, if it can be received, is compounded of α priv. and αμαρτάνω. The Professor asks why, if νηλεῶς

is by an aphæresis for ἀνελεῶς, are there no indications of this in Homer? and, if it is compounded of α priv. and ἔλεος, why do we never find ἀνελεής, or ἀνελεῶς? But it is evident that the *onus* lies on Blomf.'s shoulders; for, if we can produce any words, in which νη is evidently a component part, as we trust we have already done satisfactorily, and explain those instances, which he has adduced in support of his theory, it must fall to the ground. With regard, therefore, to ἀνήκεστος, ἀνηκουστίω etc., the Professor remarks that they are improperly written for ἀνάκεστος, ἀνακουστίω etc. being compounded of α priv. and ἀκέομαι and ἀκούω respectively, ν being inserted *euphonia causa*. The lengthening of the second α depends upon a principle in Homer's versification, which Professor Dunbar has the merit of having discovered." *Edinburgh Monthly Review of Dunbar's Additions to Dalzel's Collectanea Majora, for March 1821.*

"Alcman ap. Antig. Caryst. 27. Οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρθενικαὶ μελιγάρυες ἱερόφανοι, Γυῖα φέρειν δύνανται· βάλε δὴ, βάλε κήρυλος εἶην, 'Οστ' ἐπὶ κύματος ἀνθος ἄμ' ἀλκυόνεσσι ποτῆται, Νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, ἀλιπόρφυρος εἶαρος ὄρνις! Welcker. Fr. 12. νηλεὲς deletiv, quod sensu caret, et Photii Lex. sequutus, rescipsit ἀδεῖς: optime quidem ad Lyrici mentem; sed ἀδεῖς est scholium. Antigonus, quod non animadverterunt VV. DD., Casaub. ille ad Athen. 9, 16. Niclas., Welcker., alii, ipsam poëtæ manum exhibet, modo paullulum adjuvetur, et pro ΝΗΛΕΕΣ reponamus * ΝΗΔΕΕΣ, mutatione levissima. De adjectivis, cum particula priv. νη compositis, v. Fischer., qui ad Weller. Gr. Gr. 3, 241. loca Grammaticorum et Auctorum exempla diligenter excitavit. Νηδεῖς Schol. quum interpretaretur, ad marg. ἀδεῖς scripserat; et glossa, ut fieri solet, in textum irrepsit, atque vocis ποιητικατέρας et legitimæ locum occupavit. Notandum insuper ἀδεῖς metro prope adversari; et pronuntiandum saltem foret, vel scr., quod nunc exhibent Hom. Codd., ἀδδεῖς." Boissonad. in Wolfii Anal. Liter. N. 3. p. 75. 1. To this ingenious conjecture I am prepared to assent. 2. The words, βάλε δὴ, βάλε κήρυλος εἶην, are illustrated in the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 24. a—25. a. from which I will cite the following note as exhibiting, in a very small compass, an instance of the utility of the work, and as supplying Professor Gaisford with a correction of Suidas, and Dr. Blomf. with a Fr. of Callim.:—"Suid. Βάλε· βάλε, τὸ τρίτον. Εἶη. Ἀντὶ τοῦ, εἶθε μοι. (Ed. Mediol. Βάλε· βάλε τὸ τρίτον εἶη, ἀντὶ τοῦ, εἶθε μοι.) Sic Jeg. putat Kuster.: Βάλε· ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἐβάλε. Τὸ τρίτον πρόσωπον. Καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶη, εἶθε μοι. Imo respexit Suid. ad Callim. versum, quem nobis conservavit Diomedis Schol. in Dionysii Thracis Gr., in Bekk. Anecd. 2,

946.: Τὸ α κατ' ἰδίαν ἐστὶν εὐκτικὸν ἐπὶ ῥῆμα, ὡς τὸ αἶθε, καὶ τὸ βάλε ὁμοίως κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπὶ ῥῆμα εὐκτικόν. Βάλε μοι, βάλε τὸ τρίτον εἶη, Καλλιμαχος. Hoc Fr. frustra quæsimus in Ruhnck. et Ernestii Auctario, ac Blomf. Spicilegio. Suidæ locum sic restituendum censemus: Βάλε Βάλε μοι, βάλε τὸ τρίτον εἶη. Ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶθε." 3. Μελιγάρες Boissonade has tacitly substituted for μελυγάρες as wrongly edited by Welcker. 4. Ἰερόφωνοι, considering that the previous epithet is μελιγάρες, and that the poet is addressing *virgins*, one might be tempted to ask if the right reading were not ἱμερόφωνοι, or ἡμερόφωνοι? See the *New Gr. Thes.* p. 1281-2. where the words ἱμ. and ἡμ. are amply discussed: 5. and yet the epithet ἱερός cannot be deemed foreign to the notion of *dancing* or *singing*, which was used in all the *religious* exercises of the ancients. Dionysii Hymnus in Apollineum, (Jacobs. Anthol. 2, 231.) Γλαυκά δὲ παροιθε Σελάνα Χορὸν ὄριον ἀγεμονεύει. "Quid sit χορὸς ὄριος, non plane perspicio. An sic vocantur stellæ, quia tempora anni moderari et temperare putantur? An ὄριον pro ὠραῖον positum *Pulchrum, Fulgentem chorum* signif.?" De Onione cogitavit Sneedorf.; sed hic est Ὀρίων, non Ὀριον. Nec video, quomodo verborum syntaxis ejusmodi interpretationem fecerit possit." Jacobs. The Editors have in the *New Gr. Thes.* proposed to read *IEPON* for *ΩPION*. Ὀριος et ἄριος are confounded in Anthol. Palat. p. 769.: χορὸς θεῖος, Odyss. θ. 264

"Ad νηλεῆς, νήνεμος etc. quod attinet, clarum est, ἀνηλεῆς, ἀνήνεμος, omni pondere in commissuram inclinato, syllabam initialem obscure et tenuiter prasonantem missam fecisse. Auctor mihi est *Blomf.*, qui ad *Prom.* 127. tirones meminisse jubet, νηλεῶς per aphaer. formari, non autem ex particula νη, 'quam, si me audias,' inquit, 'a Græcia abjudicabis. Valckenaerius, vir longe eruditissimus, sed qui in etymologia parum videbat, aliter sentiebat, putabatque, νηλεῶς a νη et ἔλεος componi, ut νῆστις. Quod si verum est, quid fiet ἀνηστις? Quinimo νηγρετεῖν et ἀνηγρετεῖν, [so Lobeck writes for νήγρετος et ἀνήγρετος, which are the words employed by Blomf.] νήνεμος et ἀνήνεμος, νήκεστος et ἀνήκεστος promiscue adhibentur.' *Invidiosam illam Valckenaerii laudationem* silentio transmittamus, [see *Aristarchus Anti-Blomf.* vi-viii.] hoc unum a Blomf. quæram, unde νήκερος ortum putet? An ab ἀνάκερος? Non poterit aliter dicere. At hoc vanum et nihili vocabulum est. An igitur Valckenaerio assentientes particulam νη inter communia Gr. linguæ formamenta referemus? Ne, id quidem. Si me interrogas, res ad hunc ferme modum est. Quæm νήκεστος, νήνεμος, νήριθμος, et talia multa in consuetudinem sese immersissent, quorum rationem paullo ante, ut

facultas tulit, explicui, mox hebescente εἰνι sensu etiam alienigenis transitus in hanc familiam datus est, νηπαθῆς, νήκερος." Lobeck. ad Phryn. Ecl. 711.

3. ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE:

Letter to E. H. B. from an American Scholar.

"Sir,

"I HAVE lately seen in the *Class. Journ.* [xlv, 67.] an interesting Dissertation on the Pronunciation of the Greek Language by Professor Reuvens of Leyden. As that question, after having been so long neglected, is again attracting the attention of scholars, permit me to present you with an Essay on the same subject, which I communicated some time ago to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and which was published in Vol. III. of their Memoirs. From the knowledge I have of your own learned researches in Greek Literature, both in English and Continental publications, I cannot hope that you will find in my little work anything, that is not more familiar to you than to myself. But the like knowledge of your ardor in this study has also led me to believe that you would not be displeased at seeing any work, however imperfect, on a favorite subject, from this new country; and I cannot but entertain the hope that, after diligently studying the works of yourself and other European scholars, we shall be able in our turn to render some services to the common cause of learning.

"Permit me to remark, in respect to the pronunciation of one of the letters, the λ, that, since the publication of my Essay, I have ascertained that the liquid or Italian sound, which I had stated with some hesitation, upon the authority of the two Greeks named in the Work, is a provincial peculiarity. I state this, not as information to you, but merely as a correction of an error on my part.

"In a note at the end of the Pamphlet p. 69., I have remarked on a difficulty, which has much embarrassed the learned Tittmann in his Prolegom. to Zonaras' Lexicon p. 33., where that learned Editor acknowledges himself to be at a loss how to account for the appellation of *Arsenius' Lexicon*, which he found in one of his Mss. I have offered a conjecture by way of solving the difficulty, which appears to me, (as conjectures com-

monly do to their authors,) to be well-founded ; but how far it is so, you can much better judge than myself.

“ I am, Sir, &c. J. PICKERING.

“ *Salem, near Boston in Massachusetts. Nov. 15, 1821.*”

This Pamphlet is printed in 4to., and containing as it does 70 pages, it is of too great length for insertion in the *Class. Journ.* The following extract from it, p. 3., will convey to the readers of this periodical work a sufficient idea of its purport :—

“ I may here remark that I have felt the greater desire to communicate to the Academy the information thus obtained respecting the pronunciation of the Modern Greeks, because it led to a strong conviction in my own mind very different from the opinion I once entertained of it. Adopting the opinion, which was first propagated with success by Erasmus, (who, however, did not adhere to it himself in practice,) I had long supposed their present pronunciation to be grossly corrupt, and wholly different from that of their ancestors. But the attention I have given to the subject, in consequence of my frequent conversations with the two Greeks I have mentioned, and an examination of the controversy, which took place in the age of Erasmus, (which will be more particularly noticed hereafter,) have occasioned a change in my opinion. It now appears to me highly probable, nay almost certain, that the Greeks of the present day pronounce very nearly as their ancestors did as early as the commencement of the Christian era, or at least just after that period. As this opinion, however, is contrary to that, which has prevailed among our countrymen, and probably among most members of the society I am now addressing, I have thought it proper to exhibit, as concisely as possible, some of the principal arguments, upon which it is founded. In doing this, I shall make no pretensions to new or original remarks ; but shall only attempt to select such facts and observations of the writers on this subject, as appear to be the most important in a general view of the question, and such as may, I hope, incite some persons of more leisure and ability than myself, to prosecute this interesting inquiry.”

The inaccuracy, into which Mr. Pickering had fallen respecting one of the letters, and which he has candidly corrected in the above letter, shows the extreme caution, which it is proper to use in forming opinions on this subject from personal conversations with modern Greeks. An enlightened friend, to whom I lent the book, returned it with the following remark :—
“ The error in his book appears to me, thinking the ancient

Pronunciation of the Greek Language. 167

pronunciation of Greek to have been uniform. Look at the map of the countries bounding the Mediterranean, and you see merely narrow slips of land with large provinces behind them of civilized and powerful states, speaking other tongues. Necessarily such a tongue must divaricate into endless dialect."

The note at the end of the Pamphlet, to which Mr. Pickering alludes in the Letter to me, is this:—"I call it Zonaras' Lexicon after the Editor, Jo. Aug. H. Tittmann, who gives several reasons of some weight for ascribing it to that author. Nor does the circumstance mentioned in his Prolegom. p. 33. affect the probability of his supposition; though the learned Editor seems to be at a loss how to account for it. He observes of one of his Mss.:—'In folio singulari, quod post thecam ad compacturam Cod. pertinet, legitur, *Arsenii cujusdam Lexicon Gr.* Hinc etiam in Catalogo Nesselii impresso et deinde in Bibliotheca Fabricii sub titulo illo commemoratur, [6, 631. Ed. nov. Nessel. Pt. 4. p. 74.] Sed quæ causa fuerit, cur *Arsenio*, nescio cui, hoc opus tributum sit, *frustra rescire cupio*, neque de *Arsenio* quodam, Grammatico aut Lexici Auctore, mihi quidquam constat.' The source of this blunder in the Ms. (for a blunder it certainly must be,) is, I think, discoverable on examining the Lexicon. The words are all arranged in five classes—masculine, feminine, and neuter nouns, verbs, and adverbs, which last class comprehends the other parts of speech. Now it happens that the first class of words under the letter *A*, consists of *masculine* nouns, and it is accordingly entitled '*Ἀρσενικὸν*', which word, being seen at the head of the Ms., would be mistaken by some owner of it for the name of the author. If the work had begun with the class of *feminine* nouns, (*Θηλυκὸν*,) we might perhaps have had *Thelycus' Lexicon*." This conjecture is perfectly satisfactory.

Thetford, July, 1822.

REMARKS
ON THE EXAMINATION OF THE
PRIMARY ARGUMENT OF THE ILIAD;
AND ON THE
HISTORY OF THE ÆOLIC DIGAMMA.

Sanguinis Auctor
In tam præcipiti tempore ferret opem.
Ferret opem certe. ♀

A LEARNED writer for the Quarterly Review of July, having prepared a paper in which he contends, with considerable erudition, ingenuity, and taste, that there is "reasonable cause of doubt, whether the *open vowels* in Homer's poetry, which suggested to Bentley the remedy of the *Digamma*, be really a *defect*;" is indignantly disappointed, because he meets with nothing about a *digamma* in a work engaged on a subject totally distinct, namely, an *Examination of the Primary Argument of the Iliad*; and he complains, that he "does not find an efficient co-adjutor and co-partner for his undertaking, in the author of the *Examination*," whom he therefore denounces, as having thrown away "his time, his talents, his philology—in short, his whole book."

That is; a gentleman passionately fond of wild-fowl, accepts an invitation to eat venison; and, because he finds no wild-fowl provided for his entertainment, he declares, that his host's venison is not worth the eating.

Finding at length that his paper, in spite of all the extension which he has given to it, is still too brief to form a separate publication, our offended critic casts about to see how he can bring it before the learned world; and, instead of sending it to some Classical Repertory, for which it was so well fitted, he has fallen on the ingenious expedient, through a little malversation of office, of hanging it out in his Review on the title-page of the *Examination*, so as wholly to cover and conceal that work. The work itself, which is formally summoned for review, is dismissed in twenty lines savoring of his disappointment; whilst his own *History of the Æolic Digamma*, of which he shows no relation whatever to the subject of the *Examination*, is distended into 30 closely printed pages; exercising, (if we are bound to believe his modesty,) "a narcotic influence, both over his own senses, and those of his readers."

We might here remark, (we copy the regal style of our censor) on this oblique method of obtruding a subject; and on the surprise, which the substitution of a thing unlooked for, for the thing

On the Primary Argument of the *Iliad*, &c. 169

expected, must naturally produce. As if, (for our comparison here changes,) a gentleman were to invite his friends to eat venison, and nothing were to be served up but varieties of wild-fowl. Although this oblique method, of *by-viewing* publications, has become so frequent as to have lost much of its strangeness, still we are not become so intirely accustomed to it as not to be surprised, that, when we are invited to an *Examination of the Primary Argument of the Iliad*, which is the *venison* in our comparison, we are only served with an *History of the Æolic Digamma*, which is the *wild-fowl*.

But, though we shall not dwell on this obliquity, we know not how we can refrain from remarking on the apparent dereliction of critical justice, in citing, as the title of an author's work, that which his title does not bear; and in exhibiting, as his argument, that which he has not proposed as such. The author of the *History*, has thought fit to fabricate a new and presumptuous title for the *Examination*, which he has compounded of detached sentences culled from the body of the work; and to fabricate also a new argument, consisting of a corollary deduced by himself from the argument professed. The motive which governed these fabrications is obvious; it was such a motive as would be condemned in a civil court, namely, to bias the jury before the pleadings have commenced, or to strain the evidence before the verdict is delivered.* We should condemn such a measure in a civil court; and are our self-erected literary courts freed, by public opinion, from the obligation of those principles by which all other courts are bound?

There is always, however, this satisfaction for those who experience such artifices of malversation; that they demonstrate a consciousness of inability in the judge fairly to meet the question before him. This disclosure, though insensible to the party using the artifice, is glaring to every by-stander; and there is nothing which more effectually convinces a plain understanding that a cause is good, than when the party evincing hostility to it does not hazard an attempt to show that it is bad, but endeavours to conceal his inability to disprove it, under an outward bearing of silence and contempt.

The true title of the work cited by the learned By-viewer, is simply this—an *Examination of the Primary Argument of the Iliad*; and the true argument which it professes to maintain, is simply—the *Unity of that Argument*. The treatise on the *Æolic Digamma*, however learnedly and ingeniously that subject may be therein treated, will not over-rule, so easily as its author wishes it to be supposed, the powerful and consentient evidences which establish and confirm the other, very different subject—the *Unity of the argument of the Iliad*. In vain will he endeavor to smother those evidences, by spreading over them the variegated tissue of

170 *On the Primary Argument of the Iliad,*

his own *History* ; he only betrays, by that stratagem, a sense of his inability to grapple with the argument which he shuns ; and a desire to act the victor before his readers, without making them the witnesses of his failure. The argument of the *Examination* still challenges his best abilities. Let him not expect thus to get rid of it ; it may militate against some learned prejudices, deeply rooted and partially cherished, but those prejudices will, in the end, be extensively unrooted by it. Let him not so cast up the counter-scores of *reasoning*, as to exhibit a balance of credit on his own side, which he will find himself obliged to strike off. Instead then of making a demonstration of having thrown his antagonist, let him fairly face it ; let him descend into the arena, and make some trial of his strength with it.

Quis circum pagos et circum compita pugna
Magna coronari contemnat Olympia, cui spes,
Cui sit conditio dulcis sine pulvere palmæ?

The adversary is soon found ; it stands before him, prepared and collected, in all gymnastic guise and attitude :

φαῖνε δὲ μηρὸς
καλοῦς τε, μεγάλους τε, φάνεν δὲ οἱ εὐρέες ὦμοι,
στήθεά τε, στιβαροί τε βραχίονες· ἀντάρ ἈΘΗΝΗ
ἄγχι παρισταμένη μέλε' ἦλδανε.

If he cannot discern it in this athletic form, it must be owing to the " complication " of his own views, and not to that which he is pleased to attribute to the arguments of the *Examination*. In order to frustrate all similar pretensions to a *dustless triumph*, the *Examination* has taken the precaution of concentrating, into three pages,¹ the point and force of its main argument. Let our secure critic, then, adventure the task of encountering his adversary only in those three pages ; which we will presently produce to him ; before he affects to walk as conqueror over the field of the work. If he can fairly overcome it, we pledge our critical honor, that he shall find in us no symptom of dissatisfaction at his success ; for, we are zealous for the argument of the *Examination*, only because we believe it to be sound and true.

The causes of " the innovations projected and carried into effect by modern critics," in the poem of the *Iliad*, are not correctly or adequately stated to the reader by the Reviewer ; indeed, he appears not to have been clearly and perfectly aware of them himself, and on that account it is, that he depreciates the argument of the *Examination*. The causes of those innovations, are principally *two* ; which the Reviewer does not show.

1. The first cause, was an assumption ; that the apparent irre-

gularity of the open and closed vowels in the text of Homer, proved the text to be vitiated. This assumption, which belonged to Bentley, is ingeniously, but only partially, met by the Reviewer, in his *History of the Æolic Digamma*. But Bentley, after a long course of learned and laborious experiment to restore the text by means of the digamma, abandoned the arduous undertaking; evidently deterred, by the prospect of the difficulties which perpetually multiplied before him.

2. The second, and much the most dangerous cause of innovation, was the *gratuitous* assumption; that the poem of the *Iliad* is destitute of all Unity of general argument evincing original unity of design; that it is, therefore, not an uniform body of poetry, but a congeries of separate matter, the contributions of different ages. This assumption, which belongs to Wolfe and Heyne; and which they took up, merely because they could not perceive any connecting argument in the poem; is the substantial and ultimate support of all the extravagant innovations projected by them in the substance of the *Iliad*; and this assumption is thoroughly refuted by the *Examination*, which proves, to the conviction of the commonest capacity that has kept itself free to judge upon the subject; that one, simple, sublime, argument, demonstrating original unity of design, pervades, connects, and articulates all the parts of the poem, in perfect harmony of composition. The two latter critics, and especially Heyne, far from being deterred by those multiplied difficulties which awakened the prudence of Bentley, were, on the contrary, fascinated by their very magnitude; and were inspired by them with a restless spirit of critical knight-errantry. Bentley's "*sic corrige*," engendered Heyne's "*de-buit esse*;" and the child was resolved, to out-do its parent in intrepidity. To facilitate the operation which they were determined to undertake, those critics laid down for themselves certain principles, which the former called, "*altior critice*," and the latter, "*de digammo placita*;" and which, like the true balsam of *Fierabras*, were to cure all diseases of the *Iliad*; and all those cases which resisted their efficacy, were to be adjudged cases of interpolation, and were to be rejected from the text. Finding, however, that those adjudged cases multiplied so fast as to become fearfully suspicious to others, and exceedingly embarrassing to themselves; instead of questioning the soundness of their own principles, they only thought of looking out for, and establishing, some other principle, of a broader basis and more comprehensive nature; which should justify all their charges of interpolation, in the lump, and thus relieve them from the irksome responsibility which they felt, in imputing so large a portion of interpolated matter to the *Iliad*. System engenders system; and these learned and doughty correctors soon devised that sweeping principle; that the *Iliad* possesses no unity of general argument; but only a succession of distinct and independent arguments,

denoting distinct and independent poems; the productions of different authors, and of different ages; mutilated in the course of tradition, but variously *darned* and *tacked together* by different *later* hands: that this *internal evidence* of meddling and mixture, rendered the text of the Iliad justly liable to suspicion in *all its parts*, and confirmed the charges of *interpolation* which they found it expedient to direct against *particular passages*. They did not so much reason, from manifest corruption of the parts, to the general corruption of the whole; as, assume the corruption of the whole, in order to deduce aggravated charges of corruption against those parts which resisted their favorite principles of correction. Sometimes, indeed, they reasoned in a circle; inferring, as it suited them best, each from the other. At all times, *interpolation* was to them, what *revolutions* are to the mineral geology; an easy and convenient universal principle, for gaining establishment for a favorite system.

This was, indeed, a principle calculated to "render the question complicated and interminable;" and it therefore became indispensably necessary to meet it on its own ground, before proceeding to the arguments of detail which affected particular cases. Wolfe and Heyne were anxious, above all things, to establish this ground in the opinion of scholars; because they were sensible, that if they could do this, they might then speculate and dogmatise upon the text with undisturbed security, and with unlimited latitude. But, this ground being wrested from them by the *Examination*, it will follow; that the mere evidence, of attempts to adapt the text to the varying habits of ages following Homer, can, of itself, afford no legitimate ground whatever for suspecting interpolation of the matter. We ourselves have witnessed examples of a natural disposition to modernise the language of Chaucer, and the orthography of Spenser, yet without awakening any idea of violating the matter of their poetry; and a similar disposition, inspired by a similar motive, of adapting the text of Homer to the habits of a later age, might as naturally have actuated the Greeks, without necessarily inspiring a desire of adulterating the substance of the poem; an operation, which its diffusive publicity, and its venerated character, rendered by no means easy, to the extent that Wolfe, and Heyne, and some other systematic critics, have wished it to be supposed. The *Examination of the Primary Argument* has exposed one notable example, of the mischievous rashness of attempting to correct Homer, upon the false assumption of *interpolation*;* and we shall presently adduce another, equally fruitful in salutary admonition. It would be an easy task to multiply these examples; for, it is a fact as true as it is lamentable, that the illustrious Heyne has neutralised one half of his gigantic learning

* p. 336—347.

expended upon the *Iliad*, by the virulent spirit of system with which he has impregnated it. His attacks, are indeed vigorous and intrepid; but, his tactics resemble more those of Hannibal than of Fabius, and they will in the end experience a similar fate.

Having thus correctly stated the distinct causes of "the innovations of the modern critics;" we shall now summon within the lists the concentrated argument of the *Examination*, to the encounter of which our learned Reviewer is here invited in all heraldic form and courtesy. Let him deny, either the *premises*, or the *conclusion*. If he cannot deny, either the *former*, or the *latter*; then, the *onus* must remain with him, of showing, why the *Unity of the Primary Argument* is not proved by it? And, if that *unity* is proved by it, then it is certain, that all speculations resting substantially on an assumed *want of that unity*, and all "the innovations projected and carried into effect by modern critics," upon the ground of that *false assumption*, must fall to pieces, however splendid and endearing the trappings of learning which may have been injudiciously fastened on them. The world in general is little aware, how much of the pageantry of learning consists in trappings so attached. It is futile to say, that such an argument "renders the question complicated and interminable;" for, every mind willing to reason, and to which *all reasoning* is not *confusion*, must perceive, that its only tendency is to simplify the question, and to bring it to a term. To those who think in a tangle, every thing will continue in a tangle; but, those who wind off the thread of their thoughts, will find that they thus arrive at a term.

The *Examination*, "in taking a comprehensive view of the entire *Iliad*," arrives at these *four* general positions.

1. "That the poem manifestly distributes itself into *two* principal parts or divisions; of which, the *first* division is distinguished by the *inaction* of Achilles, and the *effects of that inaction*; and the *second* division, by the *action* of Achilles, and the *effects of that action*; and that these *two* divisions *unite* in an *intermediate point of articulation*, (the death of Patroclus,) in which point the *first* division finds its *termination*, and the *second* division its *commencement*.

2. "That in *each* of these divisions the determination of the will of Achilles is strongly declared, yet in *each* he acts in direct opposition to the declared determinations of his own will; while at the same time he acts, in *both*, in exact conformity to the *contrary declared will of Jupiter*.

3. "That, in *both* cases, that conformity is produced through the intervention of the supreme power of Jupiter, and by the means employed by him *for that end*; that his power is directed, in the *first* division, to restore the *inaction* of Achilles to *action*; and, in the *second* division, to cause that restored action to accomplish the particular purpose for which it was restored: so that the

end ultimately attained by the *action*, was the *same* for which the *inaction* was originally to be overcome.

4. "That, therefore, the *will of Jupiter* prescribes the rule of the action of Achilles, and is the *efficient* agency in the *main action* of the poem; and that the *will of Achilles* is totally subordinate to that *supreme will*, and is rendered the *instrumental* agency for accomplishing that *main action*; for, Achilles is, 1st. *made to act*—and to act by the rule of that will—when he had most resolutely determined *not to act*; and 2nd., *to do*, in substance and circumstance—by the same rule—what he had with equal resolution determined *not to do*.—He slays Hector in the field, which, from the beginning of the poem, he had determined not to enter; and he delivers up for honorable burial his body, which, at the close of the poem, he had determined to consign to the dogs and vultures of Troy."¹

Now, which of these positions will our learned censor undertake to deny? If he cannot deny any of them, it will follow from these impregnable facts; which stand in evidence upon the face of the *Iliad*, and which are placed in their fullest light in the *Examination*; "That the sure and irresistible power of the *divine will* over the most resolute and determined *will of man*—exemplified in the *death and burial of Hector* by the *instrumentality of Achilles*;" is a governing argument of the *Iliad*, co-extensive with its extent, running through all its length, and reaching to its extreme termination. And, because it is a *governing* argument, co-extensive with the poem, and corresponding in all its parts by the intimate relations exposed in the *Examination*,—*Unity in the poem* is thus demonstrated. And further; because *no other* argument, besides this, governs and unites all the parts of the poem, this argument is thus proved to be *the primary and governing argument*; and the *onus* remains with our opponent, of showing that *it is not*. And how has he attempted to relieve himself from that *onus*? by the summary and convenient judgment; "It would be difficult to *prove*, or to *disprove* it!" That is, "*it is, or it is not*," according to the awful response of the *wise woman of Brentford*; and he expects his readers to receive this oracular decision with reverent contentment, and to say with Simple; "I thank your worship; I shall make my master glad with these tidings." But, *we* have shown *him* the facility of the *proof*, it remains for *him* to show *us* the facility of the *disproof*.

But, this is an argument which makes "*Homer a theologian!*" If this should be the necessary consequence of the thing proved, it cannot possibly invalidate the evidence which proves the thing. Such a method of rebutting argument is as impotent, as it is be-

neath a writer who is ambitious to reveal an extensive, and intimate acquaintance with the writers of antiquity. Would he be ambitious also to be supposed ignorant, that the poems of Homer were prized by those very writers for nothing more highly, than for the store of religious principles which they contain? and which he is welcome to call *theological*, if he pleases. Would he wish to be thought ignorant, that the Platonists conferred the very appellation of *theologian*—θεολόγος, on Orpheus, Linus, and Musæus? And would not Homer be as justly intitled, as those earlier poets, to the same appellation, in all those parts of his poems from which the philosophers of Greece drew the confirmation of their theological dogmas? Virgil has availed himself of the same principle of doctrine, for effectuating the separation of Æneas from Dido; and for mastering the powerful and all-ruling passion, which detained him with her in Carthage.¹ But, that was only secondary with Virgil which was primary with Homer, and therefore it only produces an *incident* in the *Æneid*; whereas, in the *Iliad*, it manifestly *pervades, characterises, and determines the whole poem*. In spite, therefore, of this tremendous corollary of our critic, the conclusion of the *Examination* confidently challenges, and as confidently defies, his refutation.

If he thinks that he has just cause to complain, because no History of the *Æolic digamma* is found in an *Examination* of the primary argument of the *Iliad*; we are sure that we have much juster cause to complain, that no *Examination* of the primary argument is found under a head which expressly sets forth that title. Of this we do complain; not of his having supplied his *History*, which we have read with considerable pleasure, and without experiencing any "narcotic influence" in the perusal. There is a wide difference between substituting wild-fowl for venison, and supplying wild-fowl *after* venison; and we only wish, that he had adopted the latter method. Although the *History* disowns the *Examination* for a co-adjutor, yet, the *Examination* claims the *History* for its co-adjutor; for, the force of the arguments, by which the *History* shows the precipitancy of inferring defect in the vulgate text of Homer from open vowels, or *hiatus*, falls into coincidence with the arguments, by which the *Examination* shows the fallacy of inferring interpolation of the poem from an assumed defect of unity of gene-

At vero Æneas adspectu obmutuit, amens,
Adrectæque horrore comæ, et vox faucibus hæsit.
*Ardet abire fuga, dulcesque relinquere terras,
Attonitus tanto monitu, imperioque deorum.—*
——— Ille, Jovis moestis, immota tenebat
Lumina, et obnixus curam sub corde præmebat :—
*Multa gemens, magnoque animum labefactus amore. **
Jussa tamen divum exequitur.—Æn. iv. 279-331-395.

ral argument. Although, therefore, we cannot but complain of its author as a *judge*, we hail him as a "*co-adjutor*;" not intentional, we must acknowledge, but not on that account the less real and "*efficient*." And, notwithstanding the reluctance with which we are well aware he will receive our salutation in that capacity; we yet heartily thank him for protecting the *leaves* of the Homeric tree, whilst we ourselves are engaged in securing the *trunk* and the *branches*.

We consider the argument which he has ventured, in questioning "defect" or "blemish" in the "open vowels" of the vulgate text of Homer, as a step towards the recovery of the loss of a century of learned labor, exercised in seeking a panacea for those misapprehended evils. That the pursuit of the *digamma*, during that century, has excited an heroic spirit of learned enterprise, and that much important game has been started in the prosecution of the pursuit, there can be no doubt; as there can be no doubt, that innumerable herds of noble game would be staved, if adventurers were to traverse Africa, in all directions, in search of a Mammouth or a Mastodon. We think, the comparison cannot be refused us; and therefore we think, that until we can discover a *living Mastodon*, we shall never recover the *audible Digamma*. The century therefore has been lost, with respect to the particular object pursued, though much compensation has been collaterally made; and we should not have much cause to complain of the pursuit having been undertaken, had it not been attended with the raising a cloud of *systematic dust*, impairing the discernment of the judgment, contracting the focus of its perception, and seducing it into numerous perversities. We entirely agree with the Reviewer in thinking; that if "Bentley had been born and educated in a Southern country, his *theory of the digamma* would perhaps not have occurred to him;" and we further think, that if Heyne's vernacular tongue had not been the German, he would not have so eagerly taken up, and so tenaciously have retained, Bentley's theory, after Bentley had let it fall to the ground. We cannot but entertain a doubt, whether the triumphant joy which Heyne expresses¹ at getting Bentley's private experiments into his hands, would have afforded equal transport to Bentley in the prospect. We confess, that we never could contract any degree of that *chasmophobia*, under the influence of which Heyne exclaimed—"Quid auribus molestius esse potest, quam binæ vocales excipientes se nulla interjecta consona!"² a question, to which we shall presently reply. We are inclined to believe, that we should approach much nearer to the primitive *visible* text of Homer, by refusing all admittance not only to the *written*

digamma, but by rejecting the written *ephelcastic* ν,¹ and also the *fulcra* of κ', γ', &c., wherever the sense does not peremptorily demand them: telling ourselves at the same time, that the living pronunciation, now dead for ever, corrected every apparent imperfection; and that our awkward attempts to supply correctives in *sound*, differ nearly as much from the ancient *reality*, as the motions produced in a corpse by Galvanism, differ from the graces of voluntary action in a living body.

But, if we cannot hope to *read* Homer's poetry as it was originally *read*, we might perhaps be able to *see* it, as it was originally *seen*: and if we would then reason of its enunciation by southern instead of by northern analogies, we might reconcile ourselves to the absence of supplemental *fulcra*.

The spirit of system exercises a lamentably deteriorating influence over the mind. Heyne could hear and understand Priscian very plainly, when he said—“*hiatus causa* solebant Æoles interponere F digamma, ut, καὶ χεῖμα πῦρρε δάφιον:²—inveniuntur F posuisse pro consonante simplici, ut, οἰόμενος Φελάνην:—et, pro duplici consonante, ut, Νέστορα δὲ Φοῦ παλδος.”³ But, when the same Priscian said—“F digamma Æolis est quando in metris pro nihilo accipiebant;”⁴ then it was—“Boy! tell him I'm deaf:”—“non posse de eo tuto statui, cum sensum loci haud teneamus.”⁵ Yet, Priscian renders his meaning as plain by his illustration in the latter case, as in any of the former; and it was impossible to proceed *securely*, without ascertaining his meaning:⁶

ἄμμες δ' Φειράναν, τὸ δὲ τ' ἄρθετο Μῶσα λιγαία—

But, in vain; for Heyne was determined not to read,

ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμου πόλιν, εἶ δ' Φοίκαδ' ἰκέσθαι—

πάντων μὲν κρατεῖν ἐθέλει, πάντεσσι δ' Φανάσσειν—

And yet, in all the three cases, the F, being “*pro nihilo*,” interposes no obstruction between the δὲ and the following vowel; like the

¹ Tom. iv. 445.

² Grammat. Vet. Lat. p. 547.

³ Grammat. Vet. Lat. p. 546.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Tom. vii. 729.

⁶ The Reviewer has not correctly represented the meaning of Priscian. Priscian does not say—“*Si verissime velimus inspicere*, the digamma had never been a Greek letter, having been introduced by the Romans;” on which ground the Reviewer asks—“Why then did he, who lived six centuries after Christ, insert the digamma in Greek lines composed six centuries before Christ?” No one contradicts himself so absurdly. Priscian says—“The Greeks had anciently only 16 letters: *Si verissime velimus inspicere*, the Romans also had 16 letters, to which they have added two, the F and the X.” (Gramm. Vet. p. 542.) But these, he tells us, they took from the Greeks. The truth seems to be, that as Priscian said of the Latin h,—“*aspirationis magis est nota, quam litera*,” and again, “*h literam non esse ostendimus, sed nota aspirationis*,” so he regarded the digamma of the Greeks, which was “*genus aspirationis, spiritu aspero diversum*,” (Heyne, vii. 709.) as being also, “*aspirationis magis nota, quam litera*”

178 On the Primary Argument of the Iliad,

Latin *h*, in *adrectæqu' horrore—pactosqu' hymenæos*—where it is certainly “*pro nihilo*.” This last observation of Priscian, however, unlocks the difficulty, which Heyne is determined to keep locked in his *Excursus* on λευκώλενος “*Ἡρη*,”¹ rather than to surrender a particle of his “*de digammo placita*.” If we are unable to affirm, whether *Ἡρη*, or “*Ἡρη*,” was the most ancient form of the word; we at least clearly collect—in πόρνια “*Ἡρη*,” “*hiatus causa digamma interpositum*,” if the form was “*Ἡρη*,” or in λευκώλενος “*Ἡρη*,” “*digamma pro nihilo acceptum*,” if it was *Ἡρη*. But Heyne would rather suppose “*Ἡρη* and *Ἡρη*, ἦδος and *Ἡδος*, &c., to have been different forms of words; than understand, that they were the same forms, only that in λευκώλενος “*Ἡρη*,” and ἔσσεαι ἦδος,² the digamma was “*pro nihilo acceptum*.” And yet, why suppose different forms, when we are certified, that there existed a principle of articulation which diversified the same form? This simple and complete solution, however, will be found good for all similar cases throughout the Iliad; it disentangles innumerable perplexities, and it rescues the Homeric text from Heyne’s desperate and merciless pruning-knife in those six passages, to which he will not administer this gentle remedy, but which he cuts and slashes till he makes them fall from the tree:

πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλει, πάντεσσι δ’ ἀνάσσειν.—A. 288.

“ κείν’ ὄχρα κρυτέοντες ἄναξ δ’ ἐνόησε τάχιστα.—O. 453.

ἱεμένους φοβέεσθαι, ἐπεὶ λίπον ἄρματ’ ἀνάκτων.—Π. 507.

σὺν γένος· οὐ οἱ αἰεὶς ἀνασσέμεν Ἀργείοισιν.—T. 124.

ὕψηλῃ, τὴν Μυρμιδόνες ποίησαν ἀνακτι.—Ω. 449, 452.

For, no vice whatever can be detected in these passages, either in the text or context, except that they refuse to conform to his “*placita*,” and his “*placita*” only require their conformity, because he would hear only *one half* of Priscian’s information; but would not listen to the *other half*, in which he was warned, that the digamma was capable of being occasionally nullified in metre, or rendered *evanescent*; so that the preceding letter might pass through it, (as it were,) and come into immediate contact with the following vowel: which *evanescence*, or *quiescence*, affords a tolerable proof of its *tenuity*.

Bentley, appears to have been near recognising this principle of *quiescence*; for, Heyne himself informs us, that he read ἐν αὐτῷ δέσπερον ἐτύχθη—ἱππους δ’ οἷς ἐτάροισι;³ though Heyne abstains from drawing out any of the necessary consequences of the principle. He also tells us, in his margin, that Bentley read, ἡέρα δ’ Ἡρη, in Φ. 6; but he has let the reading pass without any remark, either in his Notes, or Observations.⁴

¹ T. iv. 173. and vii. 756.

³ T. vii. 729.

² T. vii. 730. and 754.

⁴ T. ii. 454. viii. 115, 6.

We are well aware, that other learned persons have thought this lucid illustration of Priscian to be *obscure*; but we are convinced, by its very nature, that the obscurity which they ascribed to it, resulted wholly from the refractive medium of a *previous system*—an *altior critice*—through which they viewed it; and from hence alone have arisen so many unfounded charges of *neglected digamma*, and thence, of *interpolation of the text*; as we shall hereafter show. Priscian further illustrates his position from the early Latin poets; who, in their metre,¹ he says, likewise held their digamma, at times, “*pro nihilo*,” and he cites in evidence a verse of Terence, in which, by a similar evanescence of the digamma, the *in* in *invidia* is rendered short; that is, the *n* is brought into immediate contact with the following *i*, the *v* being “*pro nihilo*”—*in-i-dia*. Not *inuidia*, for then it would be “*pro vocali*,” as he instances in δάφιον;² and not “*pro nihilo*.” And this he further shows, by reading the *vit*, in *solvit*, as two short syllables, by *resolution*—*sol-uit*; but the *invi*, in *invidia*, as two short syllables by *nullifying the v*, and rendering it “*otiosam—vacantem*,” like the *h* in *inhio*, *inhibeo*.³

What was the particular sound which the living pronunciation introduced before “*Hpn*, *ἀναξ*, and other digammatized words, when the preceding vowel was open, we shall in vain expect to discover. Quintilian says, that it was “*medius V et I literæ sonus*.”⁴ We may be persuaded, that it was at the least semi-vocal; that it probably varied in its enunciation before different words; and was determined, or qualified, by the vowel which succeeded. It might be questioned, how far the old Ionians introduced the sound; and whether the affluence of vowels was not as much sought by their “*mollissimæ aures*,”⁵ as it is now dreaded by our staunch modern digammatists: so easily and sweetly do the vowels succeed to each other in the flow of Homer’s verse, if we can only emancipate ourselves from the prescriptive tyranny of northern and modern intonation and modulation. This question may be reasonably entertained with respect to a people, whose enunciation resolved contracted vowels, and refused the *fulcrum* of the incipient guttural aspirate; whose organs of speech, and of hearing, preferred *ἡλίοιο* to *ἡλίον*. If, then, they avoided the *h*, or guttural,

¹ Gramm. Vet. Lat. p. 546-7.

² Ib. p. 547.

³ “*H*, inter literas, *otiosam* Grammatici tradiderunt.” Victorinus: *Gramm. Vet. Lat.* p. 2455. “*Hanc etiam Grammatici volunt vacare*.” Terentianus: Ib. p. 2388. What do these passages mean but, “*pro nihilo accipiebant*?”

⁴ I. c. 4.

⁵ Heyne, T. iv. p. 444. Heyne strangely takes for granted, that “*mollissimæ aures*” always call for *consonants*. We venture to think, that they rather call for *vowels*; and that those “*aures*” are “*durissimæ*,” which most require, and can best endure, the continual clapper of consonants.

180 On the Primary Argument of the Iliad,

aspirate, it may be reasonably doubted, whether they used the *F*, or *labial aspirate*, so extensively as the modern digammatists have assumed. Aulus Gellius has a tasteful remark on certain *hiatus* in Homer, which shows that he was not affected with the modern *chasmophobia*. “Vocalis in priore versu extrema, eademque in sequenti prima, canoro simul atque *jucundo hiatu* tractim sonat. Est adeo invenire apud nobiles poetas *hujusmodi suavitatis* multa, quæ apparet *navata* esse, non fortuita. Sed, præter cæteros omnes, apud Homerum plurima. Uno quippe in loco tales *tamque hiatus sonitus* in assiduis versibus *pluris facit*.”¹

ἡ δ' ἐτέρῃ θέρει προρέει εἰκνῖα χαλάζη,
ἡ χιόνι ψυχρῇ, ἡ ἐξ ὕδατος κρυστάλλῳ. X. 151.

Heyne, it is true, *tolerates* the final hiatus; but then it is not through a principle of taste, like Gellius, but by a dry rule of prosody.

But, to whatever extent the old Ionians did employ the labial aspirate, or *F*; (and we know, that out of *five* words instanced by Dionysius as having the digamma, *three* did not receive it from Homer—Ἐλένη, ἔλος, and ἀνὴρ;²) we may be assured, that it was of so soft and tenuous a nature, that we shall approach much nearer to the effect of their pronunciation, in our reading, merely by articulating the vowels distinctly, and marking the arsis and thesis, than by admitting any determined intermediate sound of modern suggestion; which cannot fail to be, both false and barbarous. We are persuaded, that we may apply to the digamma in all cases, what Heyne applies to it only in the middle of words: “digammi notatio parum utilitatis affert ad lectionem et scriptionem poetæ.”³ We never could comprehend that exquisite affection, which was composed at the sequence of *α* after *ε*, in the reading, ἄλγεα θῆκε, but disturbed at the same sequence in, Ἀρτεΐδης τε ἀναξ. We are convinced, that we may articulate *ναιομένῳ ἑάνασσε* (instead of *ἦνασσε*,⁴) without the intervention of *two* or even of *one F*; and with as little violence to our organs of speech, or hearing, as *πῶεα οἶων*; or *πῶεα μήλων*, as Heyne bids us read, from Strabo,⁵ without any *F*; the same utterance which yields *πῶεα μή*—, will assuredly yield, with equal facility, —*ῳ ἑάνασ*—.

Of the tone of the *ephefcustic* or *paragogic*, and in general, of the *final ν*, we may perhaps form a more distinct idea than of that of the *F*; from Quintilian's description of it. It appears to have been a clear, sonorous, and pleasing though nasal sound, semi-vocal, analogous to the *ringing* of a metallic vibration, *jucundus*,

¹ VII. c. 20.

² The same is to be observed of *εἰρήνη*; which does not appear with the digamma in Homer, but which, we learn from Priscian, was *φειρῶνα*, in the Æolic.

³ T. vii. 769.

⁴ Π. 572. See Clarke's note on v. 172.

⁵ A. 677.

*et quasi tinniens*¹—produced by dwelling upon the first intonation of the *η*; yet so, that it should not strike with appulse upon the following letter, if a consonant; and should supply a fulcrum, if a vowel. The contrary open tone, of the final Roman *m*, which he compares to the lowing of an ox, appears to be preserved in the *ao* or *em* of the Portuguese. We shall in vain attempt to recover the true sound of the *ephelcustic η*; but its place would perhaps be more fitly noted by a mark, (as in the Portuguese *ao*,) than represented inadequately by a decided consonant; or, it might be merely supposed, in all cases where the ear feels the need of a *fulcrum*; as in such lines as those cited by Heyne:

ὠρσῇ δὲ Θρηκῶν βουληφόρον Ἰπποκόωντα.—K. 518.

ἄψ τ' ἀνεχώρησῃ, ὥχρὺς τέ μιν εἶλε παρείας.—Γ. 35.

αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ᾗσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ, φώνησῃ τε.—A. 333.

————— "Αἶδι προΐαψε

ἡρώων

Ib. 3.

With respect to the British digamma, *w*, or *waw*, which occurs in our *winegar*, *weal* and *wenison*, and which has been so perseveringly forced into the verse of Homer; we cannot conceive how any one, appealing to *the ear*, can expect a passport for such associations as these: *meteweipe wanax*—*woisi wecastos*—*we wekon awekonta*—*weruonta widon*—*hos weipon wou*—*wiliou wiphi wamassein*. Is it possible to persuade oneself, that Homer *wee-waw'd* thus to his Ionian auditory; with a woolly English *w*, always in his mouth, and keeping an ascendancy in the ear like the drone of a hurdy-gurdy, or a bag-pipe?² We have no difficulty now in answering Heyne's question; "*quid auribus molestius esse potest, quam binæ vocales excipientes se nulla interjecta consona?*" for we reply, without any hesitation, "*Britannicum digamma interjectum*." We think we see the fate of this pretender, in this exhibition; and indeed, the muse of Spenser seems to have inspired him with something of vaticinian flexiloquence, when he said:

"Thus on this rock they rent, and sunck in *endless waves*."³

We have now to produce our second example, of the mischievous rashness of attempting to correct Homer by arbitrary and defective "*placito de digamma*;" and of supporting the corrections on the false assumption, that the *Iliad* is destitute of unity of argument, and *therefore*, interpolated throughout. In Ω. 449, 452, we have these two lines;

ὑψηλὴν, τὴν Μυρμιδόνες ποίησαν ἀνακτι—

ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ μεγάλην αὐλὴν ποίησαν ἀνακτι—.

Priscian, as we have seen, has left this rule for us upon record;

¹ Quint. xii. c. 10. p. 1093. 4to.

² See, on the pronunciation of the Digamma, *Valpy's Greek Grammar*, pp. 201, 2. 8th Edition. Ed.

³ *Fairie Queene*, B. ii. c. 12. s. 4.

182 On the Primary Argument of the Iliad,

"*est quando*—on some occasions, the digamma is nullified in metre—in *metris pro nihilo acceptum*." Thus, we saw it nullified or evanescent in δ *ῥεφάναν*; where, like the Latin *h* in *miranturqu' habuisse*, it does not oppose the elision of the preceding vowel by the succeeding one. By the same principle of evanescence, in λευκώ-λενος *Ῥήρη*, it leaves the final consonant free to fall upon the following vowel, and, like the Latin *h*, in *mæstissimus Hector*, it adds no length to a short syllable. Thus it is, also, that in these passages, ποίησαν *Ῥάνακτι* acquires, by the same principle or practice, the same quantities with ποίησαν *ἄκοιτιν*;¹ as in the Latin, *nomen habentes*. Bentley and Dawes, overlooking this important, but too plain and simple notice of Priscian, proposed to change ποίησαν, to δειμοντο, or πονέοντο; assuming the *F* to be always in full activity as a consonant: a very convenient method, no doubt, of getting rid of a difficulty. Neither of these proposals, however, approved themselves to Heyne; and so far he judged soundly. But, instead of being led to question his own "*placita*," he at once peremptorily decided, by their authority, that the readings are incurably corrupt—"ex mea sententia emendatio locum non habet;" that the whole passage is an interpolation—"totus locus de tentorio Achillis aperte est insititius a seriore rhapsodo;" and he rejected the entire eight lines between v. 448, and 547; affirming, "procedebat antiquum carmen sic:"

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κλισίην Πηληϊάδεω Ἀφίκοντο,
δή ρα τόθ' Ἑρμείας ἐριούνιος ᾤξε γέροντι.

By this operation, he got rid at once of both the rebellious ποίησαν ἄνακτι. But, Heyne's system of correction was that of an amateur amputator, whose *hand is in*; and who therefore advises amputation, where another would recommend gold-beaters' skin, or, perhaps, only washing the finger.

There is, at a first glance, an apparent connexion and corre-

¹ This simple and lucid principle, may satisfy us at once in the lines,

χάρη δ' ἔρα οἱ προσίοντι

Σαρπηδὼν, Διὸς υἱός, ῥέπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπε.—E. 683.

But, Heyne must tell us: "Διὸς υἱός ῥέπος vitiose. Scilicet debuit esse

χάρη δ' ἔρα οἱ Διὸς υἱός

Σαρπηδὼν προσίοντι ῥέπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπε.

Now, to this "*debuit esse*" we reply: That there is no one line in the Iliad, in which Διὸς υἱός is found at the end, or, in which the final thesis falls on the last syllable of both words; we find the termination, Τενθρηδόνος υἱός—Νέστροπος υἱός—Τοῖο γὰρ υἱός, but never Διὸς υἱός. The ear alone is able to account for this avoidance; for, what can be more ungrateful to it, than this whole emendation of Heyne? Compare with it, his emendation of the last line of the Iliad and his "*esse debebat*," in the Examination, &c. p. 156. We find his emendations attended with the same cacophony, in both places. We may well call these, with Ernesti, "*absoluta decreta*." But, Homer's *harp* is to be put out of tune, that he may be judged by one half of the rules which governed his modulation.

spondence between these two lines, which may satisfy an idle, or seduce an uninquiring reader; but, a few moments' reflective attention, to the passage, and to the context, will reveal the slovenly criticism and unpardonable wantonness, with which this great scholar would perpetrate this remorseless mutilation of the true text. According to this reading of Heyne, ᾤξε can only look back to κλισίην—ᾤξε κλισίην, *he opened the tent*. Let us then follow the story, with this reading: "Mercury *opened the tent* of Achilles, and *brought in* the splendid gifts, (sc. ἐπ' ἀπήνης—*on the car*,) and got down from the chariot. Priam also got down; and, leaving Idæus with the mules, went *strait to the house*—ἰθὺς κίεν οἴκου—where he found Achilles." Thus stands the story, *after Heyne's amputation*. But, what is signified by ᾤξε κλισίην? We had just before, ᾤξε πύλας, καὶ ἀπῶσεν ὄχῃας: this was an operation demanding an exercise of divine power; but, what need was there of that intervention, for simply *opening a tent*? Besides, what was that *tent*, within which the carriages were driven, and *in which* was the οἶκος, or *dwelling-tent*, wherein Achilles resided?

But, let us now, with Heyne's good leave, take into the relation the *circumstances*, which he has expelled merely that he might maintain, *per fas et nefas*, his "*placita de digammo*."—"When they arrived at the trench and fortifications, Mercury put the sentinels to sleep; and immediately unbarred and opened the gates, and brought within them Priam, and his splendid gifts, *in the car*. But, when they reached the tent of Achilles, *around which was a spacious court, and a close palisade, with a door fastened by a huge bar, which Achilles alone was able singly to remove*, then Mercury *opened it*, and brought in the rich gifts, and descended from the chariot." Here, we have *Homer*; there, we had only *Heyne*. We now understand; that Mercury, first, opened, by his divine power, the *gates* of the Grecian fortifications, and brought in the carriages: that the tent of Achilles was surrounded by an open court, and by a palisade in which was a *gate* secured by a *heavy bar*: that Mercury *opened this gate also*, by his divine power, and brought the carriages through it, *into the court*: that he then descended from the chariot, and disappeared: that Priam next got down, and went *strait across the court to the tent*—οἴκου—of Achilles; which *he entered*, without any divine assistance." We see then, that ᾤξε, in v. 457, which Heyne labors to refer to κλισίην in v. 448, refers, and can only refer, to κληῖδα or θύρην, in his rejected v. 453, 455; ᾤξε θύρην, as just before, ᾤξε πύλας. The *whole* of this description is moreover indispensably necessary, for *giving sense* to what Heyne leaves untouched; for, what meaning has ἰθὺς κίεν οἴκου, if Priam was already *in the tent*? What operation is denoted by, Ἐρμείας ᾤξε κλισίην, if there was no impediment *to be removed*? Yet, such is Heyne's inconsistency and incaution, that although he would expunge those *eight lines* because *two words* rebelled against

his "*placita*," (though they submitted to the ancient "*placita*" reported by Priscian;) he not only remarks, "*habemus hic designationem accuratam tentorii Achillis, &c.*;"¹ but he elsewhere shows, *critically*, that $\phi\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is *absolutely inapplicable* to $\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\eta\nu$, and *can only be legitimately applied* to $\Sigma\upsilon\rho\eta\nu$.² Both the $\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ $\alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\iota$, therefore, vindicate their own genuineness, in the vindication of the genuineness of the passage of which they are integral parts. This is *one* of those numerous passages, (*ab uno disce omnes*,) of which Heyne says, and on ground as loose as this, "*fatendum est, verum a rhapsodis esse insertum cum toto loco, ad explendam narrationem. Cujus generis loca multa in Homericis mihi videor observasse.—Sane invictis argumentis talia probari non possunt.*"³

The assumed *neglect* of the *digamma* by certain assumed rhapsodists, is the avowed ground of the principal suspicions which have been raised against the text of Homer. "In versibus a *rhapsodis* in Homericis Carmina illatis, *digammi neglectus* in oculos incurrit; et haud raro *interpolatio ex eo ipso neglectu arguitur.*"⁴ But if we find, that we are directed by the rules of the ancient pronunciation to understand, that, in passages where the *digamma* is supposed by modern critics to have been *neglected*, it is, in point of fact, *not neglected*, but only, is *metrically evanescent*, and accounted "*pro nihilo*;" what a cluster of knots must at once become untied; what a scaffolding of learned system must drop at once to the ground; and what a chain of argument, for inferring *interpolation* of the *Iliad*, must necessarily be snapped asunder, and fall to pieces! Yet, this important distinction is totally overlooked; because all judgment on this subject is committed to Heyne, who has *not made the distinction*, and from whom nevertheless we are not supposed to appeal. "Qui amplio rem rei hujusce notitiam desiderat, ei auctor sum ut *Heynii labores pensiculatorum examinet.*"⁵ We also desire no other, than that Heyne's "*placita*" should be examined "*pensiculatorius*," provided system and prejudice be entirely banished from the examination; because we venture to think, that the ge-

¹ See his note, T. ii. p. 640.

² "Apud Homerum, $\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\alpha\nu\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, dicitur η $\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha$, $\alpha\iota$ $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota$, *nusquam* δ $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma$." T. vi. p. 555: therefore, "*nusquam* η $\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\eta$. Est $\omicron\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omega$, $\alpha\nu\omicron\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omega$, *proprie removere*. T. ii. p. 642. Upon this very principle he has corrected Clarke's text, in E. 168.

³ Tom. iv. 57.

⁴ Heyne Tom. vii. 715.

⁵ "Quam rationem sequer in *digammo notando* et *exprimendo*, (never, *supprimendo*.) diu dubitavi.—Videbam, sexcenta loca inter se bene convenire; restare tamen *haud pauca alia, quæ sub certam præceptionem revocari nequirent*.—In observando *non* *digammi* in Homericis, *primarium* erat, ut ille esset *constans ac perpetuus*, &c." Heyne Tom. vii. p. 725, 723, 728. But, if this last position is *unfounded*, what havoc must be made with the text, to render that *use—constantem ac perpetuum*?

⁶ Maltby, *Obs. Lex. Græco-Prosp.* p. xliii.

neral argument, respecting the digamma in Homer's verses, will, in that case, lead to a very different conclusion from that which has been of late years so actively deduced, to the prejudice and discredit of his poems. We suspect, that the general argument will then be found, in a few words, to stand thus :

Priscian has transmitted to us certain ancient rules, concerning the digamma ; some of which respect its *use*, but, one of them respects its *disuse*. One of the former is, "*hiatus causa solebant Æoles interponere F digamma*;" the last is, "*est quando in metris digamma pro nihilo accipiebant*." That is; *they sometimes supplied a digamma, for the sake of an hiatus* ; and *they sometimes nullified the digamma in words which habitually had one*. Numerous examples of all those practices, unquestionably occur in the text of Homer. Heyne, however, has established his "*Placita*" on the *former rules only*, to the total exclusion of the last ; and he therefore admits none of its examples. It is manifest, that if the text be tried by the *former rules alone*, and if it be tried by all the *rules in correspondence*, the results must be widely different, nay, in direct contradiction to each other. Heyne has tried the text by the *former rule only*, respecting the *use* of the digamma ;¹ even in cases where the digamma was metrically *disused* ; and the results of that *partial and defective* trial, are now adopted as the *universal canon* for deciding upon the state of the text of Homer. But, surely it is desirable to our *reason*, before we decide finally upon the text, that it should be tried likewise by *all the rules* of Priscian, *in correspondence* ; and that the difference of the results should be cautiously noted. And, in making that trial, it is evident, that we are not to be bound by "*placita*" founded upon the contrary trial ; but, that we stand altogether as free, in examining the Homeric text by our *complete* criterion, as the author of the "*placita*" did, when he made the trial with a *part only* of the means which were afforded him. Let us then summarily observe, to what issue a trial of the text, by *all* Priscian's rules, *inclusive of the last*, would appear to lead us.

We know, that the *hiatus* between final and incipient vowels were avoided, in the articulation of Greek verse, in *three* different ways : either by *subjoining* to a final vowel the *epheletic* *ν* ; or, by the labial aspirate *F* commencing the following word ; or, by introducing *between the two* the guttural or dental tones, *κ*, *γ*, *ρ*. We can represent the two former of these by one and the same superscribed line, whose *power* would be manifest from its *position* alone ; as, *ἐλπε* — *ἀνακ*. If we were closely to examine the point, it is possible, that the other *fulcra* would prove to be *suffixes* to the preceding word, in cases where the final *ν* was not employed. Now, since "*est quando*"

¹ It is thus that he comes to his premature axiom, "*usus digammi in Homericis est constans et perpetuus*."

186 On the Primary Argument of the Iliad,

the incipient *F* of digammatized words was *not expressed* in metrical articulation, and consequently, where it is to be accounted "*pro nihilo*" in written verse; it becomes a necessary inquiry—*when* is that "*quando*," in which the digamma is *metrically quiescent*, or *evanescent*? And we should reply:

1. It is *quiescent*, when it is preceded by a word, of whose last vowel the *metre* requires the *elision*: as in ἄμμες δ' εἰράναν—πάν-
τεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν—εὐ δ' οἶκαδ' ἰκέσθαι—οἴσσεε δ' ἄρν'.—ἔτι δ' ἔλπετο
—τὴν νύκτ' Ὀλνείδαο.

2. It is *quiescent*, when a preceding *diphthong* is to be made *short*; as in, πλείονων δέ τοι ἔργων—ἀλλὰ σύ περ μοι ἀναξ—ἀφίξεται Ἴλιον
ἱρὴν—διασκοπιᾶσθαι ἕκαστον. This has place after the diphthongs, αι, ει, οι.

3. It is *quiescent*, when the *shortness* of the preceding syllable, closed by a consonant, is to be *preserved*; as in, λευκώλενος ἦρῃ—
ποίησαν ἀνακτι—Διὸς υἱὸς ἔπος—ἀεικὲς ἀνασσέμεν—μοι κακὸς εἶδε-
ται—κροτέοντες ἀναξ.

4. But, its frequent and close recurrence would often render it importunate, and offensive to the ear; as in ἔκρινε εἰδίκασι—προ-
σέειπε ἀναξ—μεγάροισι ἐείκοσι—. How was that offence to be avoided? The only way to avoid the cacophony, was to render the incipient *F* *quiescent* in those cases, and to close the preceding vowel with the sonorous and grateful *epheleustic* ν, instead; thus, shifting the *fulcrum*, distributing the tones according to the gratification of the ear, and enouncing, (as we find it in the text,) ἔκρινε εἰδίκασι—προσέειπε ἀναξ—μεγάροισι ἐείκοσι.¹ There can be little question with respect to the advantage of thus *shifting the fulcrum*, and *nullifying* the native power of the *F*, if we trace its importunity through all the margins of Heyne's Iliad; and suppose it to be as often *pronounced*, as it is there *exhibited*.² Here then are *four cases*, in which, by the principle of Priscian's *last* rule, wholly disregarded by Heyne, there will be no plea whatever for arguing interpolation, or vitiation, of the text of Homer, upon the ground of a *neglect of the digamma*: for, it will be evident, that the digamma, instead of being *ignorantly neglected*, is *artfully suppressed*.

¹ We thus find, "*rationem et analogiam, cur retrahatur alterum digamma.*" See Heyne, T. vii. 735.

² We have a strong evidence of this advantage, in Γ. 103; where Heyne tells us, "*debut esse Folere Fdpr*," but, where the text reads, *Folere δ' ἄρν'*; the *F* being *pro nihilo* in the latter word, in order to allow the elision of the ε; and the δ becoming the *fulcrum*. Can there be a question, which of these readings would have the *euphony*, and which the *cacophony*; whether we pronounce the *F* as *w*, *v*, or *f*? Yet, the welcome δε, welcome equally to sense and sound, is to be branded as *spurious*—*insidious*, and to be turned out of doors; merely that the evanescent *F* might be restored to substance by Heyne's Teutonic taste, to embarrass the line with a presence, from which the Ionic taste of its author had been careful to remove it.

5. But, it is not clear that the Ionians may not, in many cases, have rendered the *F* quiescent, after an open vowel; with a view to produce that sweetness of effect, which Gellius remarked in the final hiatus. It is probable, that they did so; wherever they found the transition from one vowel to another easy to their utterance, and pleasing to their ear. Quintilian has remarked the greater ease, and grace, with which some vowels follow each other, than others; and the expression, or suppression of the *F*, would probably have depended upon the particular vowels which fell into concurrence.

With respect to *hiatus*; much perplexity seems to have resulted, from not having ascertained, exactly, what constitutes that *hiatus* which may truly be called, "*auri molliori intolerabilis*,"¹ and which therefore demands a remedy; but, on the contrary, from having assumed, that it is the *universal effect* of "*binæ vocales excipientes se, nulla interjecta consona*." Heyne himself is aware, that the principle of inserting the *F* may be carried to an absurdity: "*res tandem versa est tantum non in lusus, cum, ubicunque duæ vocales se excipient, interponere juvaret digamma*."² Vicious hiatus might perhaps occur, where a short final vowel before another could not yield the time required in *cæsura*, and must therefore fail, if not sustained.³ But, wherever there can be immediate *transitus* from one short vowel to another, as in, *χεῖρα ἐν—ἔπειτα ἐν—αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια*,⁴ it would seem that there can be no "*hiatus intolerabilis*;" but rather, "*jucundus hiatus*," as Gellius speaks, and therefore, no sufficient reason for urging, or even supposing, the insertion of a digamma; at all events, it is more pleasing to account it "*pro nihilo*." But, this subject leads to a more extensive inquiry than this place will permit.

Now, if the text of Homer will, in general, bear a trial by the test of the *entire canon* of Priscian; if no *internal vice* can be detected in the particular passages arraigned; and if the charge, of a want

¹ Heyne vii. 716.

² Ib. 768.

³ We venture to suggest to the Reviewer, that his equivocal but fascinating ἵδεντι, in E. 36. (see Q. R. for July, p. 66.) is probably no other than a corruption of ἰδεντι, with its digamma. We read in Ψ. 850.

αὐτὰρ δ' ὀρέεντ' ἦσι τίθει φέεντα σίδηρον.

We should perhaps read, in E. 36:

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτα καθέσθην ἐπὶ φέεντι Σκαμάνδρῳ.

In both places, the word will intend *darkness* or *deepness of hue*:—"ut τὸ μέλαν declaret." Comp. Heyne viii. 528. iv. 603, 4. vii. 760. Homer calls Scamander, ποταμὸς βαθύβυτος, in T. 73. and Φ. 603; and the epithet would thus be acquired, from the *visible effect* of its depth. Here, *hiatus* is remedied by the digamma.—We find the *ictus* of *cæsura* in the last syllable of ἐπὶ, and in the same place in the verse, in T. 226. and Φ. 31; but no where else in the Iliad. In those two passages, the feeble *cæsura* is sustained by the *double consonants* which follow; In ἐπὶ φέεντι, the *F* will stand "*pro duplici consonante, ut Νέστωρ δὲ Φόβ' ἰαυδός*."

⁴ Conf. Heyne vii. 748. and 747., and iv. 7.

of general and harmonising unity in the poem, is proved to be absolutely unfounded, and most unskilfully made; is it agreeable, or offensive to reason, that Homer should be tried and condemned by "*placita*" founded on only *one half of the canon*; and that we should consent, implicitly, to sign the warrant for his execution under such a judgment? Are we intirely to forget, that the greatest learning, when it has deeply implicated itself in system, is no other than dignified error?

Thus then we see the pernicious consequences of attempting to criminate the text of the *Iliad* by defective and fallacious assumptions, respecting the power of the digamma; and of supporting those attempts by false assumptions, respecting the structure and composition of the poem. We may now see the importance of inquiring both into the *Primary Argument of the Iliad*, and into the *History of the Digamma*; and we shall be satisfied, that by the proof of the consistent *unity* of the poem, and by the proof, that the digamma was, occasionally, as *neutral* in the Greek metre as the *h* in the Latin, the *Iliad* will be justified from more than nine-tenths of the charges of *neglect* and *corruption*, which have been so assiduously and passionately preferred against it by Heyne, that he might enjoy the exercise of an Imperial Criticism.

But we must remember the "narcotic influence" of 30 pages. We shall therefore conclude our remarks, with assuring our very learned, but very impatient censor, that we freely fling away all the resentment which he has intitled us to cherish towards the obliquity of his judgment of our *Examination*; and that we cheerfully justify his natural partiality for his own *οἰκεῖον* F: of which we may say, certainly with about as much wit as Cicero, "*tuum Digamma noveram.*"

July, 1822.

GRANVILLE PENN.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XXX.

*Verses by Lord Carlisle; to Lady Holland, on the Snuff-box
bequeathed to her by Bonaparte.*

LADY, reject the gift!—'tis tinged with gore!

Those crimson spots a dreadful tale relate:

It has been grasp'd by an infernal Power,

And by that hand which seal'd young Engbrien's fate.

Lady, reject the gift!—beneath its lid
 Discord, and Slaughter, and relentless War,
 With every plague to wretched man, lie hid;—
 Let not these loose, to range the world afar.
 Say, what congenial to his heart of stone,
 In thy soft bosom, could the 'Tyrant trace?
 When does the dove the eagle's friendship own,
 Or the wolf hold the lamb in pure embrace?
 Think of that 'pile, to Addison so dear,
 Where Sully feasted, and where Rogers' song
 Still adds sweet music to the perfumed air,
 And gently leads each Grace and Muse along:—
 Pollute not, then, these scenes;—the gift destroy;
 'Twill scare the Dryads from that lovely shade;
 With them will fly all rural peace and joy,
 And screaming Fiends their verdant haunts invade.
 That mystic Box hath magic power, to raise
 Spectres of myriads slain—a ghastly band;
 They'll vex thy slumbers, cloud thy sunny days,
 Starting from Moscow's snows or Egypt's sand.
 And ye who, bound in Verdun's treacherous chains,
 Slow pined to death beneath a base control,
 Say, shall not all abhor, where Freedom reigns,
 That petty vengeance of a little soul?
 The warning Muse no idle trifler deem:
 Plunge the cursed mischief in wide Ocean's flood;
 Or give it to our own majestic stream—
 The only stream he could not dye with blood.

IDEM GRÆCE REDDITUM.

Φόνων ἄδωρα δῶρ' ἀπόρριψον, Χλόη—
 τὸδ' αἱματῶδες σήμα πῶς δεινὸν λαλεῖ—
 ἐνερθε γὰρ ἐν τοῖσιν ἔχθιστός τις ἂν
 κατέρεξε δαίμων, Ἐγγιάνου μόρσιμον
 φανερόν χαρακτῆρ' αἵματος. Ῥίψον, γύναι,
 ἄδωρα δῶρ' εἰσαῦθις ἐν καλύμματι
 Ἀγρῆς, Στάσις τ' ἀνοικτὸς, ἥδ' καὶ Φόνος,
 καὶ Λοιμὸς, ἀνθρώποισι πένθη, λανθάνει—
 μὴδ' αὖ πλάνοιτο τοιάδ' ἔχθιστην πλάνην.
 Ἡ τις λιθώδης συγγενοῦς στήθους πόθος
 φονίου τυράννου σημάτων ἰχνηύσει πάλιν;

φίλοι κτόν' αἰετὸς τίς ᾧ πασεν χάριν ;
 λύκος τίς οἶος τ' ἦν ἀπαλλάξειν φύσιν ;
 Τὸ δ' Ἀδδισώνου δῶμα φίλτατον σέβου·
 Τῷ Συλλίῳ τε ξεῖν' ὅδ' ἦν Ῥογέριος
 ἔνθ' ἀδοποιὸς ᾧ πασ' εὐδομον γάνος,
 Χαρίτεσσι καὶ Μούσαισιν ἡγήτωρ γεγώς.
 Δρυάδων δὲ μὴ μίαινε φίλτατον τόπον—
 τὸ δῶρον ἐξάλειψον, ἐκ γὰρ ἐκφύγει
 καὶ ταῖσι σὺν Δρυάδεσσιν εἰρήνης χάρις.
 Τὰ δῶρ' ἔχει τι μόρσιμον· λυγρὸν μένος,
 ποιεῖ τε πολλῶν τῶν φονευθέντων χορὸν,
 ὕπνον τ' αὐπνον, ἥλιόν τ' ἀνῆλιον,
 ἀπὸ χειμάτων Μόσχου τέ κ' Αἰγύπτου χθονός.
 Ῥμᾶς, τυράννων δουλοῖσι δέσμασιν
 Ῥρδυνίοισιν ἐγχραυθέντας, οὐκ ἔχει
 τὸ πάντες ἐχθήσουσιν εἰς μίαν φύσιν
 πρὸς ἐκδίκησιν ἔχθος εὐγενὲς τυχόν.
 Τὴν νουβετοῦσαν Μοῦσαν εὖ λογιζέτω·
 Εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ῥίψον ἔχθιστον κικλῶν.
 Ῥδ' ὑδάτων ἄνακτι καλλίστῳ δίδου—
 ὃς οὐ ποτ' οἶός τ' ἦν μαινεσθαι φόνῳ.

R. TREVELYAN.

IN a note on Persius, Sat. iii. 9. "*Arcadiæ pecuaria*," (the droves of Arcadia) Mr. Gifford quotes Marcellus: "*Arcadiæ pecuaria, Asini. Arcadia Asinorum patria in Græcia. In Italia, Reate.*" He then adds: "Here is something gained; and as asses are now getting into vogue, some of our travelled gentry, perhaps, may be tempted *en passant*, to pick up one of them to improve the breed at home." If Mr. Gifford will confess the truth, he will acknowledge it is whispered, as well in Albemarle street as elsewhere, that of late more than one traveller has brought back an ass from Greece. A very fine one is expected from the banks of the Velino, the neighbourhood of Reate not having lost its ancient reputation. It is remarkable that Pliny ascribes to the Reatine waters the power of hardening certain animal substances.

* * *

CUMULUS.

I shall feel obliged to any of your Correspondents who will prove that the word CUMULUS is a pure Latin word; and that it was known to the Writers of the Augustan Age. D. B. H.

Εἰς' μνήμην Ἑρρίκίττης Ταππαρέλλης, τῆς προτέρας γαμετῆς αὐτοῦ,
εὐγενοῦς ἀγαθοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Προσπεροῦ Βάλβου.

Κάτθανε πρῶθῃβος φαῦ! κάτθανε Ἑρρίκίττη
κεδνή. Πᾶσα γόων ἡ πόλις Ἑριδανοῦ
ὕψιμέδουσα γέμει· περὶ δὲ στοναχίζεται ὄχθος
ἀγχόθεν ἀμπελοῖς ἀντὶα μουσοπόλων,
τοὶ πολέες θρηνοῦσι, φίλων ἐπήρα φέροντες 5
ἐσθλῶ τῆς ἐσθλῆς ὠκυμόροιο πόσει.
Ἄ δέιλαι, ἀλόχου χηρούμενε τῶς τάχα τοίης!
τίς τοι Πιερίδων πρῆξις ὀδυρομένη;
αἱ γὰρ ἀναξ ἐνέρων εἴη μειλικτὸς αἰοδαῖς,
σῆς χέλυός κε φίλην ἄδοθεν ἄθλον ἄγοις 10
οἷον ἄμ' Εὐρυδικῇ φασ' ἐλθέμεν Ὀρφέα, θέλξαι
τλάντα καταχθονίου βλέμμ' ὕλακῇν τε κυνός.
Ἄλλ' ἦτοι καὶ κείνος ὅμοιον πένθος ἀέξων
μὰς μόνον οὐρανίοις μέμψατο πολλὰ θεοῖς,
καίτοι Καλλιόπης υἱὸς φίλος εὐχετο εἶναι 15
καὶ θῆρας μολπῇ ρεῖθρά τ' ἐπέσχευεν Ἑβρου.
Ἐμπερ δ', εἰ θρήνων μετ' ἀπρήκτω ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ
σοὶ μὲν τις τέρψις, τῇ φθιμένη δὲ γέρας,
τίς κεν ἀειδέμεναι, τίς ἀνῆνται τέον ἄλγος
τῶν ξυνῶν γε φίλων σοὶ τε καὶ Ἄονισι; 20
Τοιγὰρ ἀπειρεσίοισι παρ' ἀνθρώποις ἀρίδην
σῶ σὺν ἔρω θήσεις αἶνον ἀποικομένης
εἰ δ' ἔτι γ' Ἀysonικοῖσι μετ' ἀρχαίοις τε νέοις τε
καὶ τίς Ἰαονίων νῦν χάρις ἐστὶ νόμων,
ἡνὶδ' ἐγὼ τούτων περὶήσομαι. ὦ ζυγίῃ δᾶς 25
σβεννυμένη, καὶ ἔρωσ' ὦ μέλει, ὦ φιλότης,
οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρώμεσθα· ἀπώλειτο Ἑρρίκίττη,
σὺν τε Σαιοφροσύνῃ αἰετ' Ὀμοφροσύνῃ,
σὺν τ' ὄαροι, χάριτές τ' ὤροντο καὶ ἥπιον ἦθος 30
πᾶσαν ὄλεσσε τάλας Πρόσπερος ἀγλαΐην.
Οὐδ' ὄγε γὰρ κείνης ἐροέσσης δὴ ποτ' ἀκούσει
αὐδῆς, ἐμπεράμῳς ἡδὺν μελιζομένης,
θ' λεινόου, καὶ ἀκεσσιπόνου πολυγηθέσιν οἴμαις,
οἶα πέλει τέχνης εὐχαια τερψιχάρου.
Ἡ γὰρ κέν' εἰδυῖα τὰ μουσικὰ τέθμια πασίαν 35
ἔγνω θηλυτέρων ἔξω ἀριπρεπίαν.
δάκτυλα δ' εὖ νόμα λαιψήρα, μαθόντα ληγαίνειν
κρουματικῆς σοφίης τεύχεσι καινοτέροις.

1 The author of these Greek and Latin elegiacs is the celebrated Theophrastus Valperga, Abbot of Caluso. Ed.

Καὶ γὰρ ἑναρμόνιον θεόθεν λάχεν ἔξοχα ψυχὴν ἐν φημιζομένην οὐρανόισι λόγοις,	40
οἳ ρα σὺν ἀρμονικοῦς κεκράνται κατ' ἀριθμούς, μῦθον ἢ Εὐφορβος Πανθοῖδα λέγω Πανθοῖδη, μετέπειτα Σάμω ἐνι Πυθαγόρα φῦς οὐχ ὡς οὐνόματος, σῶν ἀκοῶν μετεχω. οὐδὲ περὶ ξυνήμῃ μετάρσιον ἄσμα πολούντων	45
τῆλε μάλ' ἀπλανέων αἰδίων τε πλάνων ἄλλ' αἶψα τιν', ἀραιὸν ἐν οὐασιν, ἐν φρεσὶ δ' ὀξύν, ἀμβρόσιον νόμφης φθόγγον ἐπουρανίης· “Εἰμὶ μάκαρ· τί γόων οὐ λήγετε; Προσπέφω εἰπέ ὡς αἰνοῦσα ἴδον μ' εἰσέτι μυρόμενον	50
καὶ γὰρ καίπερ ἄσαρκος, ἀθέσφατον ὄλβον ὀρῶσα, τῇ στοργῇ χαίρω κουριδίῳ φίλου Αὐτὰρ ἄλλῃς δακρύων· τί μοι οὕτω τήκεται αλλως, σμικροῦς ἡμετέρους παῖδας ἄλθυρμ' ἐχέτω. Αὐτὸς ἀριστος μητρὸς ἐμείῳ παρήγορος ἔστω	55
ἀμφω δὲ ζήτων μνήμονέ μευ, ἱλαρῶ” Πρόσπερε, τῇ κυδρῇ σύ γε κείθεο τῆς ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἡμεῖς δὴ τάδ' ἔπη γραψόμεν ἀτρεκέα “Αἰνητὴν πάντεσσι μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς ἐπέοικεν, ἦδ' Ἐρρίχέτην χθὼν ἱερὴ κατέχει,	60
ἄνδρὶ φίλῳ τρία καλὰ λιποῦσαν τέκνα, λοχεΐης πρόσφατον ἐκ τριτάτης, ἐννεακαιδεκέτιν.”	

Memoria Henrichetta Tapparellæ, Primæ Uxoris Prosperis Balbi, Viri genere, literis, moribus, institutis clarissimi.

Occidit heu ! primæ fulgens in luce juventæ Henrichetta. Omnis sceptrigera Eridaui Urbs luctum fovet ; ingemunt inærentia contra Carmina vitiferis ripa propinqua jugis, Munere quo ratum obsequitur pia turba marito	5
Eximio eximix præpropere occiduæ. Ah miser ! ah ! tali cum ploras comparæ ademta Tam cito, Pieridum quid tibi præstet amor ? Namque utinam fidibus foret exorabilis Orcus ; Inde foret fidibus sponsa recepta tuis ;	10
Fertur ut Eurydicen conjux testudine fretus Quæsisse, hæud Stygium territus ante canem. In luctu sed enim parili conquestus et ille est Tantum cum superis irrita multa deis, Quamvis Calliope natus Permesside, quamvis	15
Carminibus sæpe feras, flumina sæpe mœtans.	

Si qua tamen fienti frustra tunc incerta voluptas
 Hinc veniet caris manibus, aut quis honor,
 Quis tua de multis, quis dicere damna recuset,
 Quos idem Musis et tibi jungit amor? 20
 Late igitur patulis per te clarissima terris
 Laus nuptæ, atque tunc nobilis ignis erit:
 Et jam si quod adhuc inter veteresque novosque
 Ausonidum Graiis est pretium numeris,
 En hos experiar. Fax o-restiucta jugalis, 25
 Tuque amor infelix castaque vota tori,
 Edamus questus. Heu! occidit Henrichetta,
 Atque una concors Cura, pudensque Fides,
 Gratiaque interit fidi comisque susurri.
 Sunt festiva tibi, Prospere, nulla super. 30
 Namque audire potis numquam jam dulce loquentis
 Vocem, jam docte, dulce canentis eris,
 Mulcentisque feros animos curasque levantis,
 Mirifica unde cluet flexus ab arte sonus.
 Nam bene culta, inter generosas una puellas 35
 Præcipua tenuit musica mente sacra;
 Et bene erat digitis docta increpuisse coruscis
 Cymbala nostra, vetus quæ nova nomen habent:
 Quippe animam nacta harmonicam divinitus, atque
 Egrege ad leges compositam superas, 40
 Una quibus ratio harmonicorum quæ numerorum;
 Utar ut Euphorbus² dogmate Panthoïdæ.
 Panthoïde, post Pythagora Samio sate patre,
 Non, ut nomine ego, sic fruor aure tua;
 Nec circum astrorum carmen sublime meantum 45
 Audio, quæque procul consena, quæque vaga.
 Ast quædam mihi vox, exilis in aure, sed imam
 Ad cor acuta, nurus devenit ætheriæ:
 Vivo beata; oculos jam tergite. Prospero, ut ejus
 Laudarim fletus hactenus ipsa, refer. 50
 Num divina licet sim gaudia, corporis experts,
 Nacta, viri primo lætor amore mei.

¹ Verba sunt Pythagorica Timæi Læri de Anima mundi: Ἀβὺς δὲ οὗτος πάλαι ἐστὶ κατ' ἀπορίας ἀπονομήσας πρὸς τὰς ψυχὰς. Edit. Paris. 1766. p. 12. (VALPERG.)

² The name of the Abbot of Caluso amongst the Arcadian was Euforbo Melesigenio. Edit.

At lacrymis satis indultum ; tabescere frustra
Jam veto ; nostra habeat pignora delicias.
Ipse meam valeat matrem solarier ægram ; 55
Jamque memor vivat latus uterque mei.
Prosperè, tu pare divæ ; cujus tumulo nos
Addemus veræ carmina pauca notæ :
Cuncti quam laudant, inprimis quos magè oportet,
Hæc Henrichettam sacra recepit humus. 60
Lustro ætatis adhuc quarto tria pignora liquit
Pulchra viro, haud cassò functa puerperio.

— — — — —

Thomæ Valpergæ Ode ad Fortunam.

O quæ superbo Diva levis pede
 Insistis orbi celsa volubili,
 Quæ vota tot, questus tot audis,
 Et stolidi maledicta vulgi ;
 Non vero habendas et tibi gratias
 Multos fateri ; quippe suæ magis
 Debere virtuti, voluntque
 Cuncta suæ pretium Minervæ.
 Tu non es uni tradere Lydii
 Gregis magistro nobilis annulum,
 Femurque reginæ resectum
 Cumque toro diadema cæsi :
 Sed ille, quassæ te sociam ratis
 Qui vidit, omnes ipse refert tibi
 Dux tantus acceptos triumphos,
 De gladio queriturque Bruti.
 Tu vel caventem, quum fugit obvios,
 Quemvis in hostem conjicis abditum,
 Vitamque quoquo vis per omnem
 Certa suo pede quemque ducis,
 Tu sæpe inertem tollis humo, jacet
 Dum strenuus frustra. Ipsa nec ingent
 Sive elegantis, sive docti, est
 Gloria te sine parta cuiquam.
 Unus tuarum navita nos vehit
 Infernus extra jura libidinum ;
 Ludusque forsàn cras futurus,
 Sæva, tibi male consenesco.
 At interim te, non humilis metu,
 Sed mente læta, Diva, cano memor ;

Non quod gravi nunquam flagello
Elicuisse mea fluentem
Non delicata collibitum tibi
De pupula sit guttulam ; amantius
Sed quod renidens nunquam, tuis non
Muneribus nimium benigna
Insanientem perdideris. Juvat
Plus nempe toto dimidium. Nihil
Cui tu negaris, patre vecors
Ille satum se Jove autumabit.

Th. Valpergæ Epigramma.

"Ορχαμ' αοιδοπόλων, θεῖον γένος, υἱὲ Μέλητος,
Οὐκ ἀναμαρτήτοις εἴκελε σοῖσι θεοῖς,
"Θέσκελον ὑμνεομέν σε φίλοι, τὸν ποιικιλόγηρην,
Θαῦμα πολυφραδῆς, ἄλλοτε σμερδαλέον,
Θοῦρον, ἐρισμάραγον διὰ τ' ἔντεα καὶ μέλαν αἷμα,
"Ἄλλοτε δ' ἡδύτροον, αἰμύλον, ἀβρόχοον,
Πολλὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα βροτῶν γένος, ὅστις ὁμοίῃ
"Ελληνας μολπῇ ἄλλος ἔταρσέ ποτε.
Εἰ δ' οὐ πάντα κατ' αἶσαν ἔφησθα, τὸ αἶν ἀκριβὲς
'Εστὶ μελισσάων, ἡμιθέων τὸ μέγα.

Th. Valpergæ Epitaphium.

Bruta mei, Thomæ Valpergæ, hic condita pars est.
Mentem animi sacris insenuisse juvet ;
Linguarum incubui auxiliis penitæque mathesi ;
Ac lusi, Arne, tuo carmine, Thybri, tuo.

The following translation of a verse in the Psalms which will be immediately recognised by every reader, is transcribed from the blank page of a book containing much other *Ms.* matter by the late celebrated scholar Gilbert Wakefield :

"Ὡς ἔλαφος ποταμοῖο ποθεῖ ῥόον ἀργυροδίνου,
"Ἰδοὺ" ἐγὼ ζῶντος ζῶντα πόθημι Θεοῦ.

Southey has employed this beautiful image almost *totidem verbis* in his poem of " Roderick, the last of the Goths :"

" No hart e'er panted for the water-brooks,
As Roderick thirsted there to drink and live."

CHRONOLOGICAL MNEMONICS.

I know not whether you are a friend to technical systems of facilitating the remembrance of points in chronology. The use of them has been much combated: but since they have received the sanction of some men of talent and knowledge, it would be unwise to condemn them altogether. Dr. Grey's system seems the most prevalent: and yet the grating sound of his chronological verses cannot but be thought detrimental to its success. I beg leave to offer to your readers a system, which, though much indebted to Dr. Grey's, is, I presume, free from some of its defects.

Let the following *vowels* represent the numbers:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a	â	e	ï	ī	ö	ō	ū	u	ù

The numerical representation by *consonants* will not be quite so easily remembered, but will cause little trouble.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
b	c	d	f	g	l	m	n	p	t

The above consonants proceed in alphabetical order: except that b, j, q, are omitted for the sake of euphony: k and s are omitted, that they may produce no confusion with c; and r is omitted, as the roughest letter.

By way of experiment, suppose the dates of the following events, which occurred in close conjunction, be required: The death of Philip—the destruction of Thebes by Alexander—the battles of Granicus, Issus, and Arbela. We may form the following spondaic:

Philip slain—Thebes-del, Gran-def, Iss-ded, Arbel-deb.

The similarity of the pronunciation in these fictitious syllables has a peculiar tendency to facilitate the memorial process. And if the chronological order be accurately preserved, as in the line before us, the facility is greatly increased, in consequence of the alphabetical arrangement: l, f, d, b. However, it is admitted that this similarity cannot occur in dates of events very far distant in time.

The fictitious terminations should occupy the whole of the last syllable, and that syllable only.

In recommending, however, this system, I cannot but express my concern that so much time is spent on the date of minute events at our Universities. Surely the division of History into certain grand epochs, well established in the memory, and the

reference of dates of a less important nature to those epochs, without the exact knowledge of their particular year, must answer every purpose of polite education—and must manifestly coincide with the necessity which that education imposes on us to attend not merely to the histories of Greece and Rome—and those unfortunately are too generally supposed to end with the death of Alexander and of the Cæsars—but to the extensive range of the whole of ancient and modern history.

Technical memory is of considerable utility in other respects. There are many circumstances, which, offering in their nature no spontaneous assistance to the memory, leave a very slight impression, and are lost immediately.

I read that Apollonius Tyaneus lived in the reign of Domitian. A few weeks may erase this fact from my mind, if I suffer it to be presented to it without some artificial assistance. If, however, I bear in mind the similarity of sound in *Tyaneus* and *Domitian*, how difficult is it to forget the fact?—Again: the *πεταλισμός* among the Syracusians was inflicted for the space of five years. How easy is the association between the *πεταλισμός* and *πέντε*. If the Romans *pollicem presserunt*, the gladiator's life was spared; if they *pollicem verterunt*, it was destroyed. The pressure then of the hand preserved the life. I will admit that, if any passage, especially from poetry, can be obtained, which mentions the fact, this is a better method: and, if we cannot obtain a verse made ready at our hands, it will be useful to turn versifiers on the occasion. Even parts of verses are efficacious: and those measures should be adopted, which are most easy of impressing themselves on the mind. For this reason the hexameters and the pentameters will be usefully employed. Our blank verse is not at all fitted for this purpose: we must employ rhyme, if we use our common metres. In cases which admit of it, derivation should always be called to our aid. Attention to the nature of things will often facilitate our memorial operations. It is better to tell a boy that a spondee by its very name leads to a knowledge of it, than to tell him it is composed of two long syllables. The same thing may be said of an iamb. and of an anapest. And how much easier would boys find it to remember the quantity of a tribrach, if they would have sense enough to attend to its derivation! Instead of this they simply read that a tribrach is composed of three short syllables: and in a little while they are quite at a loss to remember whether the syllables are two, three, or four. I have already spoken of committing verses to memory. How apt are boys to turn over the *Gradus*, and hastily look at the quantity of

a word, without even reading the verse which is set down, to see whether the quantity is wrongly marked by the error of the printer!—so far are they from steadily committing the line to memory.

The technical associations will be found of peculiar use in scientific terms. What extreme difficulty does the memory feel in impressing on itself the meaning of the plants and the animals in the *Georgics* and in *Theocritus*. At the same time I confess that it sometimes is of little use and really worse than useless, to annoy ourselves with too nice a recollection of such English terms as are equivalent to the Greek and the Latin, in these subjects: especially if we consider how little we know of their real nature, and how little satisfaction can be obtained as to an exact equivalence.

Our associations should be made as simple and rapid as possible. In this, care must be used, otherwise we shall be at as great a loss for recollection as if we had never made an association. And let me finally observe, that, though the invention of such associations may occupy some time, yet in the end we must meet with an ample reward: for, when they are once made, they are not easily forgotten: and the very labor, which we spend in making them, serves to make our acquisition of the knowledge we derive from them, more certain and permanent.

S. Y.

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

THE three Correspondents, as X. affirms in your last No., p. 358, D. B. H.—J. W.—and M., having written “much on the difficult passage in *Livy* iii. 5., but, like most writers of the present day, thrown little light on critical subjects,” it is much to be regretted that your pages have not oftener received *his more luminous contributions*. In the passage under our notice, he breaks up the *Latinity* of *Livy*, and substitutes his own.

The “*MSS.* and Editions read—“*Interim in castris Furius Consul, cum primo quietus obsidionem passus esset, incautum hostem decumana porta erupit; et cum persequi posset, metu substitit, ne qua ex parte altera in castra vis fieret. Furium Legatum (frater idem Consulis erat) longius extulit cursus, nec suos ille redeuntes, persequendi studio, neque hostium ab tergo incursum vidit; ita, exclusus, multis sæpe et frustra conatibus captis ut viam sibi ad castra faceret; acriter dimicans cecidit.*

Et Consul, nuncio circumventi fratris, conversus ad pugnam, dum se temere magis quam satis caute in mediam dimicationem infert, vulnere accepto ægre ab circumstantibus ereptus, et suorum animos turbavit, et ferociores hostes fecit: qui, cæde Legati et Consulis vulnere accensi, nulla deinde vi sustineri potuerunt; cum compulsi in castra Romani, rursus obsiderentur, nec spe nec viribus pares: venissetque in periculum summa rerum in T. Quinctius peregrinis copiis cum Latino Hernicoque exercitu subvenisset."

For, *et quum persequi—conversus ad pugnam, dum—cum compulsi, mistated "quum compulsi," read—at quum, &c.—reversus ad pugnandum—quin compulsi.* But for *peregrinis copiis, mistated "peregrinus copiis,"* we are instructed to read "*peregrè nec opinus!*"—The acmé of critical presumption.

As to *pugnandum* for *pugnam dum*, your correspondent, with his pretensions and qualifications, should have known and noticed, that it is the property of a preceding scholar, perhaps of Livy himself. X. therefore, is very cautious in his *Nota Bene*, requesting, that if any of his *emendations* be found to be the property of his predecessors, he may be added to the plagiarists of the present day.

I do not see where *his conjectural* alterations can be adopted with any other effect than deformity to the historian.

What application has *nec opinus* either to Quinctius, who, perhaps X. will allow, *was aware of his own march*; or to the Consul, who, on being repulsed to his camp *had made signal* to this same Quinctius of the dilemma?—ergo, Quinctius Consuli *inopinus* haud potuit subvenire.

To your adventurous innovator may be recommended the opinion of your learned correspondent Mr. Barker, who, in p. 346 of your last No. says, "Explanation is at all times a wiser and safer plan of criticism than emendation." In which sentence Mr. B. means "attempts at emendation:" for emendation itself confirmed and admitted, cannot but be both wise and safe.

Liverpool, Aug. 1822.

Jr W.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

ΟΝΤΙΟΤ ΤΟΤ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΟΤ ΑΕΘΕΟΝ ΣΤΝΑΓΩΓΗ. Ε.
Codice Galeano descripsit RICARDUS PORSONUS. 2 vols. 8vo.

The Delphin and Variorum Classics, Nos. 41 and 42, containing Catullus and Tibullus.—Pr. 21s. per No.—Large paper double.

Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, No. 18.—No. 19 will appear in a few days.

Select British Divines, No. 19, containing Flavel's *Touchstone of Sincerity*, &c. Pr. 2s. 6d. Continued monthly.

Les Pastorales de Longus; traduction d'Amyot, en son vivant Evêque d'Auxerre et Grand-Aurônier de France: revue, corrigée, complétée, de nouveau refaite en grande partie par P. L. COURIER, vigneron, membre de la Légion d'Honneur, ci-devant canonnier à cheval, aujourd'hui en prison à Ste. Pélagie. Paris, 1821. (To this fifth edition is joined a very curious letter from M. Courier to M. Renouard, the bookseller, the original editor of which is of the greatest rarity.)

Frid. Muntheri Episcopi Selandiæ Epistola ad vir. ill. Sergium Ouvaroff de monumentis aliquot veteribus scriptis et figuratis penes se exstantibus. Hafniæ, 1822. 4to.

ΕΥΝΑΠΙΟΣ. Eunapii Sardiani Vitas Sophistarum et Fragmenta Historiarum recensuit notisque illustravit Jo. Fr. BOISSONADE; accedit Annotatio Dan. Wytttenbachii. Amstel. 1822. 2. 8vo.

Nova Acta Litteraria Societatis Rheno-Trajectinæ: pars 1a. Traj. 1821. 8vo (This volume contains Lenting's *Observationes criticæ in Euripidem*, and P. Peerlkamp's *Observationes Anacreonticæ*.)

H. Arentii Hamaker Diatribe philologico-critica aliquot monumentorum Punicorum nuper in Africa repertorum interpretationem exhibens: accedunt in nummos aliquot Phœnicos lapidemque Carpentoractensem conjecturæ, nec non tabulæ inscriptiones et Alphabeta Punica continentes. Leidæ. 1822. 4to.

C. Jac. Chr. Reuvens Periculum Animadversionum Archæologicarum ad Cippos Punicos Musei Antiquarii Lugduno-Batavi. Accedit tabula lithographa. Leidæ. 1822. 4to.

Wytttenbachii Opuscula varii argumenti Oratoria, Historica, Critica, nunc primum conjunctim edita. Leidæ. 1821. 2. 8vo.

Mémoire sur les Antiquités Romaines de Strasbourg, ou sur l'ancien Argentoratum, par J. G. SCHWEIGHÆUSER fils, Professeur, &c. 1822. 8vo.

Notice sur les Recherches relatives aux Antiquités du Département du Bas-Rhin, par SCHWEIGHÆUSER fils. 1822. 12mo.

Notice sur le Zodiaque de Denderah, par M. T. SAINT MARTIN, membre de l'Institut, &c. Paris, 1821.

Aristophanis Equites ex Recensione Guil. DINDORFII. Lipsiæ, 1821. 8vo. pp. 127.

Sophoclis Trachiniæ: ad optimorum Librorum Fidem recensuit et brevibus Notis instruxit Godofr. HERMANN. Lipsiæ. 1822.

Über des Sophokles Aias. Eine kritische Untersuchung, nebst zwei Beilagen von Friedrich OSANN. Berlin. 1820. 8vo. pp. 154.

De Morte Voluntaria Diss. Historico-Philosophica. Jenæ, auctore Car. Herrman. SCHNEIDERO, 1822. 4to. pp. 28.

Commentatio de Notione Servitutis ap. Aristot. auctore Car. Guil. GOETTLING. Jenæ, 1821. 4to. pp. 12.

De Accentus Lege, quam Græci in pronuntiandis Nominativis Vocum Monosyllabarum tertiæ Declinationis secuti sunt, auctore Car. Guil. GOETTLING. Bonnæ, 1821. 4to. pp. 8.

De Arcadii Quibusdam Acæntuum Præceptis, auctore Car. Guil. GOETTLING. Bonnæ, 1820. 4to. pp. 12.

Corn. Nepos e Thucydide emendandus atque judicandus est, Diss. philol. auctore Car. HEINZE Philosophiæ Doct. Jenæ, 1821. 8vo. pp. 45.

Drama Christianum, quod ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΠΑΣΧΩΝ inscribitur, num Gregorio Naz. tribuendum sit, auctore H. C. Abr. EICHSTADIO. Jenæ, 1816. 4to. pp. 40.

Dav. Ruhnkenii in Antiquitates Romanas Lectt. Acad., editore H. C. Abr. EICHSTADIO. Jenæ, 1822. 4to.

Histoire d'Hérodote suivie de la Vie d'Homère. Nouvelle traduction par A. F. MIOT, Ancien Conseiller d'état. Paris, 1822. 3 vols. 8vo.

Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, tomes 5 et 6, in 4to. These two volumes contain: Mémoire sur l'Épithrace par M. GAIL; Mémoire sur la signification du mot *ἱερὸν*, par le même; sur Olympie, par le même; sur deux Inscriptions Romaines, par M. Mongez; sur une tunique Egyptienne, sur les signaux des Anciens, sur la situation de *Noviomagus Lexoviorum*, sur les graines de quelques végétaux prises pour étalons de poids par les Anciens, sur la Psychostasie, par le même; sur le droit de propriété territoriale en Egypte depuis la conquête des Musulmans jusqu'à l'expédition des Français, par M. Silv. de Sacy; sur le défi d'Apelle et de Protogène (*ap. Plin. H. N. 35. 10.*), par M. Quatremère de Quincy; sur une Inscription Grecque trouvée à Calamo en Béotie, par M. R. Rochette; sur le territoire des *Gabali* et leur capitale *Anderitum*, par M. Walckenær; sur l'Optique de Ptolémée, par M. Caussin; sur les systèmes métriques linéaires des Anciens, par M. Gosselin; sur la Population de l'Attique, par M. Letronne; sur les magistrats appelés *Μνήμονες*, *Ἱερομνήμονες*, *Προμνήμονες*, et la composition de l'assemblée Amphictyonique, par le même; sur cette question, "Les Anciens ont-ils exécuté une mesure de la Terre postérieurement à l'Ecole d'Alexandrie," par le même; sur les relations politiques des Princes Chrétiens, et particulièrement des Rois de France avec les Empereurs Mogols, par M. A. Rémusat; sur une Correspondance inédite de Tamerlan

avec Charles VI, par M. S. de Sacy ; sur les Médailles de Marinus et de Jotapianus, par M. Tôchon ; sur les Origines des plus anciennes villes d'Espagne, par M. Petit Radel ; sur les Improvisateurs Latins par M. R. Rochette ; &c. &c. &c.

Thucydides Gr. et Lat. ex recensione Imm. Bekkeri. Accedunt Scholia Græca et Dukeri Wassiique annotationes. 4 vols. 8vo. Oxonii, 1821.

This is not only an elegantly executed, but an intrinsically valuable edition of Thucydides. Some Mss. have been collated, and some readings inserted, for the first time ; and hence the text assumes, in consequence, the importance of an editio princeps as to those passages. The preface of the Editor is short, pertinent, and unostentatious ; assigning reasons in the formation of his edition, which few scholars can read without a desire to become possessed of the work. The Scholia are printed beneath the Greek text. The various readings and annotations &c. in double columns, are placed below the scholia. An Index of things, and another of places and names close the third volume. The fourth volume contains the Latin version of Duker. An edition of Thucydides, in this form, and with these helps, has long been a desideratum in the classical world ; but such a copy of it as the present, upon LARGE PAPER—of which only twelve were printed, and placed in private cabinets—must, I apprehend, become a desideratum with the curious collector, not likely to be readily supplied.—*Dibdin's Ædes Althorpiæ*, vol. i. p. 135-6.

C. Crispi Sallustii Opera. 8vo. Brixia, 1819.

This edition, which is intended also as the first volume of a new Collection of Latin Classics, is founded as to the text on the Cominian one ; the notes, which are wholly philological, are selected from De Brosses, (who meditated an edition of this author, but left it unfinished,) from Firmicus Abidenus, whose notes the editor, Barthol. Nardini, describes as " magna præ cæteris æstimatione dignæ," and from Cortius. The Editor has himself contributed a preface, a life of Sallust, and a " compendium historicum."

M. T. Ciceronis Orationes Philippicæ in Antonium, textum ad Cod. Vat. aliorumque librorum opt. fidem castigavit, not. var. edit. Grævianæ aliorumque interpretum, integro G. Garatonii commentario nondum edito, et suis animadv. instruxit, denique Manutii commentarium et indices adjecit Greg. G. Wernsdorf. Tom. I. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1821.

This volume, though it numbers 650 pages, comprises only two orations, under the text of which are placed the notes of Ferrarius, Faernus, Abramius, Grævius, Gruter, J. M. Heusinger, and the very copious ones of Garatonius. These latter were intended for vols. 12 and 13 of the Naples edition of Cicero's works begun in 1777, but being discontinued from loss of some of the Editor's papers, and want of capital, they remained for the last 20 years in the writer's desk, till the present Editor, at the suggestion of *Fr. Aug. Wolfius*, applied for them to adorn his edition. The learned writer is since dead, which is one among other reasons of their being given intire, and consequently increasing the bulk of the volume. The editor has been assisted in settling the text by a Vatican Ms., a Jena one, and one "ex Monasterio Teegernseensi." The Vatican Ms. had already been used by G. Faernus, M. A. Muretus (both of whose pre-

faces are given as containing some observations on it,) F. Ursinus, and by G. Garatonius, who calls it "omnium præstantissimus."

The Editor's notes, as indeed those of all the annotators, excepting Abramius, are for the most part critical.

Inquiry concerning the Site of Ancient Palibothra, Part IV., containing a Tour from Bhaugulpoor, to Mandar, from thence to Curruckpoor and a Circuit of the Hills, with an Account of the site of the ancient city of Jey Nuggur, and some remarks on the Jeyne worship: made during the months of December and January 1818-19: with a map of the route, views, &c. By William FRANKLIN, Lieutenant-Colonel in the Service of the Hon. East India Company. 4to. 15s. bds

An inaugural Lecture delivered in the Common Hall of the University of Glasgow, by D. K. SANDFORD, Esq. A. B. Oxon. Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. 2s. 6d.

Elements of Latin Prosody, containing rules for Quantity in English, with a full account of Versification, also classical authorities for the rules of quantity, and the Latin rules of Alvarez and Ruddiman. By R. I. BRYCE, A. M. Second edition, 12mo. 1s.

IN THE PRESS.

Political Fragments of Archytas, Charondas, Zaleucus, and other ancient Pythagoreans, preserved by Stobæus; and also, *Ethical Fragments* of Hierocles, the celebrated commentator on the Golden Pythagoric verses, preserved by the same author. Translated from the Greek by Thomas TAYLOR. 250 copies only will be printed. One Vol. 8vo. 6s.

And by the same, a translation of the *Metamorphosis*, and *Philosophical Works* of Apuleius, in 1 vol. 8vo. 18s.

The Rev. Thomas H. Horne, M. A. has in the Press a third edition of his *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, in 4 vols octavo, corrected and illustrated with numerous Maps and Fac-Similes of Biblical Manuscripts. It is expected to be ready in the course of *November* next. At the same time will be published with one new plate, a small Supplement to the second edition, (of which a limited number only will be printed), so arranged as to be inserted in the respective volumes without injury to the binding.

M. Peerlkamp, the learned editor of *Xenophon Ephesius*, is appointed Professor in the University of Leyden; he succeeds to the late M. Borger, who had succeeded to Wyttjenbach.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A friend to the Classical Journal has inquired, what languages are marked by the peculiarity of using no genders for inanimate objects. We will thank any of our correspondents for information on this point.

W's *Criticism on Livy* in No. 52.

W. on *Corinthians* has been received.

The Notice of *Gilly's Spirit of the Gospels* in our next.

On Two Passages in the *Georgics* in the next No.

Bonney's *Life of Taylor* in our next.

In *Demosthenem* Comment. in 52.

The other Oxford and Cambridge Prizes for 1822 in our next.

Itinerary of Hassen is accepted.

Æsop and Babrias in the next.

Professor Muller's *Criseos Mythologicæ Specimen* in 52.

We shall give as early an admission as possible to the *Observations* of Gesenius.

R. T.'s *Alcaics* will appear.

Some of 'The Author's' *Epigrams*, &c. will be inserted.

One of our contributors will observe, silently, that, anxious as we are to discuss the merits and demerits of a work by fair argument and impartial criticism, we cannot imitate the principles of certain party Reviewers, whose aim is, not only to expose the errors, but to ruin the character and the property, of a writer.

[ADVERTISEMENTS.]

EXERCISES

FOR WRITING GREEK VERSE,

By the Rev. E. SQUIRE, M. A.

Master of Felsted School. Price 7s.

Also a Key to the above, containing the original passages, price 3s.

N. B. This Work will be found very useful by Students at the Universities who intend to write for prizes.

Sold by J. Cuthell, Middle Row, Holborn; and H. Guy, Chelmsford.

This day is Published, in 8vo., 10s. 6d. boards, a New Edition of

THE GÜLISTÂN, or ROSE GARDEN,

By MUSLE-HUDEEN SHAIK SÂDY, of Sheeraz.

Translated from the Original, by FRANCIS GLADWIN, Esq.
London: Printed for Kingsbury, Parbury, and Allen, Leadenhall Street.

Of whom may be had, in 8vo., price 16s. boards,
THE ABOVE WORK, in the original Persian, printed from the
Calcutta edition published by Francis Gladwin, Esq. in 1806.

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

N^o. LII.

DECEMBER, 1822.

NOTICE OF

The SPIRIT OF THE GOSPEL, or the Four Evangelists Elucidated by Explanatory Observations, Historical References, and Miscellaneous Illustrations, by the Rev. W. S. GILLY, M. A. London: Whittaker, 10s. 8vo.

EVERY undertaking, whose object is to explain those passages in the Evangelical writings of the New Testament over which the hand of time, during the lapse of eighteen centuries, united with the remoteness of the scene, and the total difference of manners, opinions, and usages from their present state, has thrown a veil of obscurity, deserves the favorable, and even grateful, attention of the Christian world. That the difficulties alluded to have been removed by the investigations of learned men, as far, perhaps, as human ingenuity will permit, and complete illustrations afforded of those obscure passages, forms no objection to the utility of the present work. It may be added, as a valuable fact, that the discoveries and reports of modern travellers into the Holy Land, have amply confirmed the assertions of the sacred writers, as well as of the commentators and expositors, with respect to local customs and national opinions. But it happens that all this information is dispersed in such a variety of directions, and lies mixed up in such large masses of biblical erudition, that the generality of mankind, who have neither time nor talent for such studies, and yet are desirous of satisfaction on points so intimately concerning their faith and happiness, are compelled to remain in ignorance or uncertainty.

Before the reader can profit by the more useful of these elucidations, he must, as Mr. Gilly observes, wade through voluminous and expen-

VOL. XXVI.

CL. II.

NO. LII. O

sive productions, and pick his weary way through the endless *minutiae* of verbal criticisms, controversial questions, elaborate annotations, and curious disquisitions, most of which are written 'in unknown tongues.'

—Too expensive, too learned, or too dry, are the objections commonly made to compositions explanatory of Scripture. There is one class of persons who cannot gain access to the folios which contain the treasures of biblical exposition—there is another who, though they are not deeply versed in learned lore, and cannot therefore follow the theologian through all his profound inquiries, would wish to understand the tendency of them, and to know to what they lead, being fond of sacred reading, and anxious to give an answer to the hope that is in them; and there is another who, from their prejudice or indifference, require to be shown that the study of the Gospel is far from being so uninviting, or so destitute of literary charms as they have been led to imagine. With a view to accommodate the subject to each of these, the author has reduced his materials within the compass of a single volume, has offered few explanations which the plainest English reader may not perfectly understand; and has not, upon any occasion, inserted an illustration in any language but our own. Where it was necessary to have recourse to ancient or foreign authorities, the substance is communicated through the medium of a translation. He has likewise taken every opportunity of admitting such matter as may sometimes relieve the mind from the contemplation of graver topics, and fix it upon those beauties and graces with which the holy memoirs, as the Gospels have been happily called, are frequently interspersed. An historical reference, a tale or anecdote to the point, a custom or characteristic of the age or country in which our Saviour lived, or an elegant turn which some ancient or modern poet may have given to the subject—these have not been rejected where they could be subjoined with consistency and effect; where they are not irrelative or irreverend.

In pursuance of this plan, Mr. Gilly has selected from the Gospel of St. Matthew fifty-seven passages which in his opinion merited illustration; from St. Mark's, sixteen; from St. Luke's, thirty-four; and from St. John's, forty-six; and to each division prefixed a concise biography of the Evangelist himself, as far as it can be depended on. From each of these divisions we shall make extracts, as specimens of the whole, beginning with that much controverted subject, demoniacal possession.

Matthew viii. 28. *And when he was come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way.*

In ancient times it was an universal notion, not only amongst the Jews, but also amongst the Greeks and Romans, and the rest of the heathen world, that every disorder which took away the use of the understanding, or deprived a man of the right use of his bodily organs, was occasioned by the influence of some evil spirit. The term expressive of this terrible influence, and which has been translated 'possessed of a devil,' is of Greek extraction; and the same word, or form of words, with the same sense attached to them, as used in the Gospels, is to be met with in several profane writers both before and after our Saviour's time. *Æschylus*,

Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Lucian and others, speak of 'demoniacs;' which proves that the disorder to which they alluded had been common at all periods; and was not inore prevalent in Judea during Christ's ministry, than in other countries, and at other times. If then the complaint which went under the name *demoniacal* had been long known previously to our Lord's abode upon earth; and if it could be cured upon any occasion, which Jesus himself insinuates had been the case, 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out,' then it could be produced only by a natural, and not a preternatural cause. It may be shown that the persons whom the Evangelists describe as demoniacs were insane, or epileptic, from the terms being used synonymously, and from the particular cases of those from whom Christ was said 'to cast out devils.' The fierceness, the strength, and incoherent behaviour of some, evidently imported madness. The convulsions, the distortions, and foaming at the mouth of others, exhibited the dreadful effects of epilepsy. In the former cases, the wretched sufferers might figuratively be said to labor under 'a legion of devils;' in the latter, to be assailed by 'an unclean spirit.'

When Jesus astonished the Jews by his declaration, 'Verily, verily I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death,' they concluded that he must be insane to utter such things; and to express themselves to that purpose, they exclaimed, 'Now we know that thou hast a devil.' Upon another occasion also, they accused him of having lost his senses in similar terms. 'Many of them said, He hath a devil, and is mad:' but others who felt satisfied that such wisdom as Jesus showed could not come from a madman, replied, 'These are not the words of him that hath a devil.'—Mental derangement was for ages universally understood in the term 'demoniacal possession.' Even in the fifth century an eminent physician was blamed by Philostorgius for asserting that 'madness is not owing to the impulse of demons, but to a redundancy of peccant humors.'

If it be asked why our Saviour and his apostles should countenance the opinion of real possession, it may be answered that they only adhered to the accustomed modes of speaking on the subject. They called the malady by the name under which it was generally known, and in fact no more countenanced this hypothesis than they did the many mythological notions which the Jews entertained of a future state. Because Christ said that his disciples should 'eat and drink at his table in his kingdom,' did he mean to intimate that there would really be banquets in heaven, or did he only comply with the idioms and images then in use? The same argument will hold concerning demoniacal possession.

And on the same principle, Mr. Gilly explains the expulsion of the demons from the body of the man into the herd of swine.

'The devils besought him,' the man (who fancied himself possessed with a devil) personated the spirit by whom he thought himself afflicted, and spoke as if he himself was the very demon. His conduct was the natural result of the impression which he felt, and of a disordered imagination: in the same manner as lunatics and hypochondriacs within our own observation imagine themselves to be something which they are not, and act and speak consistently with the wild notion they have taken up. Our Saviour humored the sufferer, and replied as if he were addressing the evil spirit, by whom the man imagined himself to be possessed.

With regard to this explanation, we shall not scruple to observe that it originated with our dissenting brethren, that there was a time when it would not have been esteemed exactly orthodox, and that even now it does not meet the general assent of our church establishment. The subject is treated in a similar way in Hewlett's Annotations.

Matthew ix. 23. *And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels, and the people making a noise.*

The presence of 'the minstrels and the people making a noise,' upon this occasion, was in conformity with a custom of having musical performances, and *hired mourners* at the house where any one lay dead. (Qu. Have we not the latter of these attendants, though *mute* ?) It was formerly prevalent in every nation, and it is still usual in the east to have noisy assemblages of persons to make lamentations over the departed, and to record their meritorious actions in song, before they are committed to the earth.

Of this custom Mr. G. presents several instances from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, from Josephus, Homer and Virgil, and from the accounts of modern travellers in China, and at Tripoli, adding in a note, that

In England it has never been customary to show such ostentatious honor to the dead, or to have public wailings, and *artificial mourners*.

We have taken the liberty to distinguish by the *Italic* character the concluding words of this observation, and to suggest whether in our own country, funeral rites and ceremonies are not as ostentatious as in those eastern climes. Pride, pomp, and the assumption of grief, are not confined to vocal performances, and the infliction of personal suffering. A train of fictitious or *artificial mourners*, clad in *sable attire*, and dressed out for the occasion by the *undertaker* of the procession, all of them rejoicing in their hearts at this lucrative exercise of their profession, a pompous train of nodding plumes, and family and friendly *mourning* for many months afterwards, might be equally subject to the attack of rational animadversion. Does Mr. G. recollect the observations of Dr. Adam Clarke on this subject ? By the Mosaic law, he says that

God gave *seven days*, in some cases thirty, to mourning. Man in his own estimation ever wiser than the word of God, has added eleven whole months to the term : which nature herself pronounces to be absurd, because it is incapable of supporting grief for such a time ; and thus, mourning is now, except in the first seven, or thirty days, a mere *solemn ill-conducted FARCE* ; a *grave mimicry*, a vain show that convicts itself of its own hypocrisy. Commentary on the Bible, Genesis l. 10.

The article on the crucifixion, quoted from the same author, Adam Clarke, is worthy of being repeated.

The cross was made of two beams either crossing at the top like a T, or in the middle like an X. There was also a piece of wood which

projected from the middle, on which the person sate, as on a sort of saddle, and by which the whole body was supported. The cross on which our Lord suffered was of the former kind, being thus represented in all old monuments, coins, and crosses. This punishment was the most dreadful of all others, both for the shame and the pain of it; and so scandalous, that it was inflicted, as the last mark of detestation, upon the vilest of the people. It was the punishment of robbers and murderers, if they were slaves: but if they were free, it was thought too infamous a punishment for such, let their crimes be what they might.

The body of the criminal was fastened to the upright beam by nailing or tying the feet to it, and on the transverse beam by nailing or sometimes tying the hands to it. As the hands and feet are the grand instruments of motion, they are provided with a greater quantity of nerves; and the nerves in those places are peculiarly sensible. Now as the nerves are the instruments of all sensation, wounds in the parts where they abound must be peculiarly painful, especially when inflicted with such rude instruments as large nails, forced through the places by the violence of a hammer, thus tearing asunder the nervous *fibrille*, delicate tendons, and small bones of those parts. This punishment will appear dreadful enough, when it is considered that the person was permitted to hang (the whole weight of his body being borne up by his nailed hands, and the projecting piece which passed between the thighs) till he perished through agony and lack of food. Some, we are informed, have lived three whole days in this state. It is true that in some cases there was a kind of mercy shown to the sufferers by breaking the bones of their legs and thighs to pieces with a large hammer, in order to put them the sooner out of pain!

As this account was intended so minutely to detail the circumstances of a crucifixion, it might have been added, that while the cross lay on the ground, the criminal was fastened to it, and that both were elevated together.

On the following text from the gospel of St. Mark, Ch. ii. v. 4,

And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was; and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed where the sick of the palsy lay.

Mr. G. observes, that

One commentator has explained it by saying that 'they opened the trap-door which used to be on the top of the roofed houses in Judea.' This, however, must be an erroneous conjecture, because doubtless the space about the trap-door was quite as much crowded as the rest of the room wherein Jesus was; and the difficulty of getting near him would have been the same.

This one commentator we believe is no less a person than the learned Zachary Pearce, formerly Bishop of Rochester, who, defending the reality of this miracle against the attacks of Woolston, adopts the suggestion here objected to; and to which Mr. G. prefers the interpretation of Parkhurst, who supposes that the people came from the terrace of a neighbouring house to the flat roof of that in which Jesus was, and having 'forced up as

much both of the tiles and plaster, and of the boards on which they were laid as was necessary for the purpose, let down the paralytic's mattress through the tiles or roof into the midst of the room before Jesus: an operation which, besides its tediousness and difficulty, must, we think, have smothered all the company assembled in the room, and filled it with the materials of the interruption.

In his observations on *the cock-crowing*, we wonder that so acute a writer as Mr. G. should have omitted to inform his readers that in fact, *the cock did not crow at all*. At the times when it was most usual for that animal to crow, notice of the hour was proclaimed by the sound of a trumpet, which in common diction was called the cock-crowing. It is evident that these animals, even if kept for the purpose, might not crow at times sufficiently precise to note the hour for general information: but their usual periods, soon after midnight, and about three o'clock in the morning, having been observed, the time was announced by this artificial expedient.

From the Gospel of St. Luke we make the following selection. Ch. vii. 38,

And stood at his feet behind him, weeping, and began to wash his feet with her tears.

The relative position of Jesus and the woman, so as to enable the latter to perform the humble office of bathing the Messiah's feet with a flood of tears, while she could be said 'to stand behind him,' can only be explained by a reference to the manner in which the ancients, and particularly the orientals, took their meals. They reclined on couches, lying on one side, supporting the upper part of the body on the left elbow, and helping themselves from the table with the right hand only. As our Saviour therefore lay on the couch with his face towards the table, the woman stood at the back of the couch, and washed his feet, which, by the necessary bending of the knees, were turned outwards and behind him.

When there were many guests, the requisite number of couches, holding three persons each, were placed about the table, so as to leave one side open for the servants to arrange the dishes.

The position of the three persons on the couch was as follows. The feet of the first were disposed behind the back of the second; and the head of the second was opposite to the breast of the first. Hence the expressions, 'leaning on his bosom,' and 'into,' or 'in his bosom.' The dignity or familiarity of the guests, one with another, was intimated by their places on the couch.

Mr. G. commences his observations on the Gospel of St. John by defending him, his brother evangelists, and the apostles in general, from the usually admitted imputation of indigent poverty, and these are at least so ingeniously maintained as to deserve a copious extract.

Though John and his family were *fishermen*, yet it does not appear

that their condition was mean or contemptible; and here will be no improper place to advance an opinion, that the apostles were not so poor and so low in the scale of society as has generally been asserted. It is true that they were not men of exalted rank, of affluence, nor great attainments; neither were they the reverse of these.

Of our Lord's twelve apostles, four were fishermen; viz. the brothers James and John, and the brothers Peter and Andrew. But this occupation, so ignoble in our own times, was not considered so in an age and country, where every man followed some employment, and was taught to gain a subsistence by some handicraft. The four persons of whom we are speaking were in partnership, had more than one vessel, (Luke v. 7.) and had 'hired servants' to assist them in their labors; (Mark i. 20.) they must therefore have been traders above the ordinary level of such people as are commonly called fishermen. We also learn of two of them, Peter and Andrew, that they more than once entertained Jesus, and the rest of his disciples, at their house in Capernaum, (see Matt. viii. 14. and ix. 1. Mark i. 29. and ii. 1. Luke v. 18.) and it is the received opinion that the holy brethren usually frequented this house of theirs. Moreover, an observation is put into the mouth of St. Peter which, added to the above-mentioned particulars, argues very strongly that his circumstances were far from being indifferent. 'Behold we have forsaken all, and followed thee!' What could this intimate but that he, and some of the others, had really made sacrifices of a worldly nature?

That the two brothers James and John were likewise in the enjoyment of competence, may be inferred from the well-known fact that John took the mother of Jesus to his own house, and there supported her at his own expense after the crucifixion of the Messiah. (John xix. 27.) •

There is no doubt that Matthew's situation in life approximated rather to wealth than to indigence. He was a collector of the customs before he was called to the apostolic office; and just before he left 'the receipt of customs' to follow Jesus, it is recorded that he made a great feast in his house, and there was a great company of publicans, and of others that sate down with them.' (Luke v. 20) There could be no poverty here: and we have still farther evidence, that another of the disciples, though his name is not mentioned, moved in a respectable walk of life; for we read that he was an acquaintance of the high priest; that he was admitted into the palace of the high priest when others were excluded, and that he had sufficient influence to gain admission for Peter also. (John xviii. 15, 16.)

Thus we have grounds for contending that six out of the twelve were not men of that mean and abject condition which has been unnecessarily assigned to them: and we may be allowed to judge of the rest by these six. When Jesus was journeying through Samaria, we read that his disciples went into the city of Sychar to *buy* food, (John iv. 8.) which looks as if they were not in the habit of subsisting by eleemosynary contributions.

When Jesus proposed to feed the five thousand, it was asked by the disciples, 'Shall we go and *buy* two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?' (Mark vi. 37, and Luke ix. 13.) and when Mary poured the costly ointment upon Christ's head, the disciples murmured, and said that it ought rather to have been sold, and the amount given to the poor: upon which, our Saviour answered, 'Ye have the poor with you always, but me ye have not always.' (Matt. xxvi. 11.) What do we gather from these two transactions but that the disciples, instead of being absolutely destitute and poor themselves, had it sometimes in their power

to relieve the poor, and that their rank in society was not low, but mediocre only?

In his remarks on the miraculous conversion of the water into wine, Mr. G. observes that

It was not customary among the ancients for the master of the house, or the provider of the banquet, to preside at the table: but this office was either appointed by lot, or it was unanimously deputed to one of the party, who was distinguished by his wit, or his convivial talents. We find frequent mention of the 'Governor of the Feast,' in classic authors. We may turn to the book of Ecclesiasticus, and gather from thence that the custom had long been observed by the Jews also. 'If thou be made the ruler of the feast, lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest. Take diligent care for them to sit down: and when thou hast done with thine office, take thy place that thou mayest be merry with them, and receive a crown for thy well-ordering of the feast.' Ch. xxxii. 1, 2.

This explanation will account for the governor of the feast knowing nothing of the quality of the wine until he had tasted it. It was the bridegroom, and not he, who provided the feast.

There is a latitude in the original word which our translators have rendered *well drunk*. It may be used in the sense of *drinking to excess*, or *drinking to cheerfulness*; and this has raised objections in the minds of some, who have attempted to argue from it that our Saviour was present at a meeting where conviviality was carried to intemperance. But the facts themselves prove the contrary, as every body knows who is acquainted with the classic authors. It was the express office of the ruler of the feast to keep order, as well as to furnish conversation, and subjects of amusement: he was to see that there should be *no excess*, that every thing should be conducted with sobriety and decency. This was so perfectly understood, that Horace has a passage to this effect: 'Whoever is appointed director of the feast, I shall still be tempted to drink intemperately in the fulness of my heart, and out of joy at your return.' *Odes*, B. ii. O. v. 25, 28. Signifying that he should transgress the customary rule of preserving moderation, while the ruler of the feast presided. When there was no ruler of the feast, then the guests might drink as immoderately as they pleased; and hence the expression, 'To drink, with the cup for a president.' See Horace, *Satires*, ii. 123.

Thus the very fact of there being a 'governor of the feast' implies that there was no intemperance at this marriage-feast.

With one more extract from this Gospel relating to the Pool of Bethesda, ch. v. 4, we shall conclude our specimens of this ingenious and useful work.

Since this verse is wanting in some of the Mss., and several orthodox commentators have endeavoured to explain away the miraculous qualities of the waters, it will not be considered too bold, if a conjecture of the same kind be here hazarded. It is not improbable that the sanative virtues of the pool of Bethesda were imaginary only; and the Evangelist may be supposed to have spoken of them (as mention is made of demoniacs in other places) not in attestation of an established fact, but of a prevailing superstition. In support of this opinion the reader may be reminded that St. John is the only Evangelist who details the matter; and that the

Jewish historians, who were always very ready to relate any thing marvellous of Jerusalem, are silent on the subject. The common people may have attributed some virtue to the waters of the pool, and tradition may have handed down the particulars of some extraordinary cure performed by the use of them: but all that we are bound to believe is this, that a multitude of miserable objects were lying by the side of the water, under the expectation of deriving some benefit from the implied sanctity of the place; and that Jesus, selecting one out of these, wrought a miracle upon him, as recorded in the words of the sacred writer.

On the whole, this is a volume which it would be difficult for the best informed reader to open, without satisfaction or improvement. It condenses in a small compass the observations of the most learned and ingenious expositors, and in a form and style which must render it acceptable to that numerous class of readers, who wish for information without trouble or research, on subjects which may have frequently excited their curiosity, and perplexed their understandings. And it is embellished by quotations without reserve, from authors ancient and modern, prosaic and poetical, sacred and profane, wherever the subject admits such reference; and it is but mere justice to add, that the author has executed his task with a correctness of judgment of no ordinary description, and displayed unequivocal signs of extensive reading and happy recollection.

NOTICE OF
IDYLLIA HEROICA DECEM, *Librum Phae-*
leuciorum Unum, partim jam primo partim iterum
atque tertio edit Savagius LANDOR. Accedit Quæ-
stiuncula cur poetæ Latini recentiores minus legantur.
Pisis apud S. Nistrum MDCCXX.

No. II.—[Continued from No. 51.]

THE last lines of the poem faintly recal the matchless conclusion of the tale of Undine.

“Pan et Pitys” is a pleasing little eclogue, describing the loves of the sylvan deity (who appears to be a favorite with our author) and the nymph Pitys, who we suppose (though Mr. Landor has not informed us) was afterwards metamorphosed into a pine-tree. Part of one of Pan’s amatory addresses may exemplify our poet’s talent for rural description.

Tum placuit, poteramque loqui poteramque silere,
 Vel resupinus humi patris ultima lumina Phœbi

Aspicere, atque animas haurire fragrantibus herbis,
 Dum formis nebulae vivis per inane volabant
 Rara-ve cœruleum verrebant retia campum.
 Tu reducum interea corvorum rauca notabas
 Agmina, quæ notisque plagis ac tempore certo
 Ætheris intervalla secant nictantibus alis :
 Quid placeat nuda pallens oleaster arena,
 Quid cytisi ætiam celantia sarta cavernam
 It pellucidulis eirans labrusca racemis,
 Aut quondam humuleis mulchida gemista gemellis ;
 Qui voce arborea fueret lymphæque cachiuno
 Vel tremulo terra super a quora suda vapore,
 Nî Pitys arrepta monuisse læternæ dextra,
 Nî cantu, hæc ret quum fistula nostra, levasset,
 Et cani tactu vixissent nominis una ?

Next comes "*Coresus et Callirhoë*," of which the argument is as follows. Coresus, a young man, and priest of Bacchus at Calydon, becomes enamoured of Callirhoe, and, on her refusal, pines away with sorrow. The god, indignant at the slight offered to his minister, sends a pestilence upon the Calydonians ; the oracle of Dodona is consulted, as usual in such cases, and the result is a command to sacrifice the offending maiden at the altar of Bacchus, unless some one of the people will consent to be immolated in her stead. Her friends and relations, like those of Admetus in a similar case, all stand aloof ; and Coresus, who as officiating priest had led her to the altar, fulfils the requisition of the oracle by turning his sacrificial knife against his own breast. Such is the story, and it loses little of its interest in the hands of Mr. Landor ; the catastrophe, however, is abrupt, and (to modern feelings at least) disappointing. The best part is the address of Coresus to Callirhoë on her refusal.

The eighth idyl, "*Catillus et Salia*," is more to our taste than any of the rest, except the last, of which hereafter. The story is rather of a modern cast. Catillus, the brother of Coras, and joint founder of the city of Tibur, is in love with Salia, the daughter of Anius, king of Volsinii, by whom his passion is returned ; but their union is forbidden by an oracle, the general import of which only is known to Catillus, portending a calamitous result to the match. Desirous of more particular information, Catillus repairs to the temple of the goddess Voltumna on Mount Ciminus, from whence the oracle had been delivered ; the answer he receives to his enquiries determines him to attempt an elopement with his mistress, which he accordingly executes.

Anius pursues the fugitives as far as the Tiburtine territories, where, finding the recovery of his daughter hopeless, he precipitates himself through despair into the Pareusius, which receives from him the name of Anio. The name of the hero, in the original legend, is Cathetus; that of Catillus is here substituted, as more known, and better adapted to poetry. The gloom and silence of the oracular forest, and its effect on the feelings of Catillus, are poetically imagined.

Multa orat juvenis, tristemque silentia vocem
E cœlo, e lucis altis, ex æthe, sequuntur,
Nec, si sint ullæ, videt aëre nare volucres
Unde aliquid referat quod pectora lenius angat;
Plurima enim circum ramis ingentibus arbor
Undique porrecta est dextra, porrecta sinistra,
Nec cycni clamore lacum liquere serenum
Nec sensere sonum; procul infra in luce nitebant,
Mulcentes niveas versis cervicibus alas.

The river voyage of Catillus and his bride, on their flight to the Tiburtine country, are described *con amore*. The falls of the Anio, the scene of the catastrophe, are thus delineated, obviously from personal recollection; we were struck with the boldness of the expression in *Italics*.

—in silvam se proripit, amne sonantem
At non clamores non annim turbidus audit,
Non æra ingeminata cavis productaque saxis,
Nec rapitur furiis nec fletu solvitur, ambræ
Constringunt frontem palmæ . . quam fontis acerbi
Talibus ille locis mitescere nescius angor!
Constiterat super, infixus, neque viderat antrum
A quo, præcipiti torrente, Pareusius undas
Torquet, *et imbrifero respèrgit pulvere calum*,
Et nemore ex omni protendere guttur in auras
Mille videntur aves, quamvis torrente voretur
Dum cadit, infessæ perituum fundere carmen.
Æternum tonitru fugiant nimbique tenebras
Quas sua nec sedes quas nec suus occupat ardor,
Atqui illæ muscum si præbeat humida silva
Contentæ sobolem pascunt alisque tumentur,
Nec tonitru fugiunt nec friget amantibus imber.
Flumina sub scopulis clausa et metuentia vinci
Extollunt iterum capita erumpuntque caverna,
Sparsa ruunt, collecta ruunt, caligine pallet
Mons, teneræque tremunt et inhaerent arctius herbæ.
Plurima, quæ nullas spirabit conscia curas
Vallibus aut lucis, vibrata susurrat arundo,
Virgineoque sinu vetiti languescere flores;
Et radii innumeri circumque supraque vagantur
Aere, pensilibusque exsurgunt vitibus arcus,

Centum purpureos alte construxit Apollo
Omnipotensque pater; Thaumantias incolit Iris,
Hasque vocat proprias et nunquam deseret ædes.

The next, "*Veneris Pueri*," is an account of a contest between two Cupids, who, in imitation we suppose of Apollo and Pan on another occasion, choose Silenus as the arbiter of their differences. We now come to the last and longest of these pieces, "*Ulysses in Argirippa*," being about the length of one of the books of the *Æneid*, and in fact a miniature epic, though without much regularity of plan. With the exception of a preliminary episode, which might with advantage be detached from the poem, it may be considered as a sequel to the tale of Ithaca, comprising the adventures of Ulysses subsequent to the action of the *Odyssey*, and terminating with his death by *Telegonus*. And here we cannot but admire the extraordinary boldness of our author. With the recollection of the most interesting poem of antiquity full in his view, he has not scrupled to attempt a continuation of a subject in which he had been preceded by Homer.¹ He has seized the wand of the mighty magician, and attempted to evoke once more the shades of the heroic dead. Such an enterprise could be justified only by the most splendid success; and all we can say of the present aspirant is, "*magnis tamen excidit ausis*." The fact is, that the spell is broken—the secret is lost. The Sibylline leaves remain, and will remain, but the voice of the prophetess is heard no more. To use the words of an eloquent writer, when speaking of the Greek tragedy, "the moulds, in which those beautiful creations were cast, are for ever broken." It would transcend the powers of Homer himself, were he now living, to write another *Odyssey*. To say the truth, this detailed matter-of-fact narrative of what Homer has left untold, militates with our associations. We do not wish to see the obscurity in which he has involved this part of the subject,² exchanged for the "light of common day." Mr. Landor is not the first who has thus called the long-suffering hero of Homer from his "place of rest," to wander once more over land and sea. Not to mention the well-known pas-

¹ The reader will of course understand, that when we speak of Homer as a single person, we are merely complying with a common mode of expression, for the sake of convenience.

² See the speech of Tiresias, *Od. A.* 118—136; also *Y.* 264—284.

sages in Dante and Tasso referring to this subject, there are, we believe, several Portuguese poems in which Ulysses is celebrated as the founder of Lisbon; an event which was likewise intended to form the subject of an episode in Pope's heroic poem of Brutus.¹

The poem opens at the time of Ulysses' return. And here we have to arraign Mr. Landor of a gross breach of poetical privilege. Venus (as far as we can gather from the very obscure manner in which this part of the story is related) incited principally by a pique to Minerva, procures from Jupiter, that the man whom Penelope meets first on the ensuing morning, shall be her accepted lover. Jupiter, however, had previously ordained that this happy individual should be no other than Ulysses himself, who was then newly arrived. This is, we must say, in bad taste. We can allow a few liberties to a man like Mr. Landor; but we cannot permit him thus to outrage our most cherished associations, and to spoil our favorite characters by modern sophistications. It may be said, that the reputation of the heroine is saved by ascribing her passion to the irresistible influence of a malignant deity; still the charm is dissolved. She is no longer the *περίφρων Πηνελόπεια* of Homer—that lovely personification of matronly dignity and conjugal tenderness, which so enchants us in the *Odyssey*. We could as easily tolerate a new version of Shakspeare's Imogen or Desdemona. It is almost as bad as Racine's conversion of Hippolytus into a modern innamorato. It is remarkable, indeed, that when later poets have undertaken to alter the incidents or characters of Homer, the alteration has usually been for the worse. Such is the case with Virgil and the Greek tragedians. It is but justice to add that Mr. Landor has made as much atonement as possible for this error, in his subsequent representations of Penelope. We ought here to mention, that by a very beautiful fiction, the father of the gods is represented as rewarding the exemplary constancy of Ulysses by conferring upon Penelope the gift of renovated

¹ We understand (and we are sure the reader will pardon our introduction of the circumstance here) that the people of Ithaca, subsequently to their deliverance from the Turkish yoke, have instituted a festival in commemoration of their ancient hero.

youth, a miracle of which Ulysses is described as unconscious, owing to his remembering her merely as she was at the time of his departure from Ithaca, and forgetting, in the illusions of love, the transforming effects of time and anxiety on the outward appearance.

The scene now shifts abruptly to Argirippa or Arpi, the seat of Diomedes, whither Ulysses had retired in consequence of a prophecy, foreboding his destruction by his own son. To avoid this denunciation, which he naturally interpreted of Telemachus, Ulysses resolves upon perpetual self-banishment. He is received with the greatest warmth by his former companion in arms, and we have a long fire-side conversation between our old acquaintances, the one giving an account of his domestic misfortunes, his new colony, and his prospects, and the other of his manifold wanderings and adventures. And here occurs a new version of the story of Circe. Ulysses, on the night of his first landing on the shores of *Æa*, sees in a dream the form of his Penelope, who addresses him as follows. Every reader of Homer will recognise an imitation of the most pathetic passage of the *Odyssey*, the reply of Anticlea to her son.

Forma manet, dulcique ut quondam voce loquelæ.

"Jam procul absentem, jam desine flere sepultam,
O Laertiade! nulli datur inter Achivos
Conjugibus caris olim optatisque redire
Incolumi natis; has improbus occupat ardor,
Hos agit extorres patrio violentia regno.
At me, mille precis ad fata extrema petitam,
Obtestor superum, si fas modo, numina divum,
Nec tetigit novus ullus amor, nec funere mersit
Intempesta dies, nec amaræ tela Dianæ;
Sed tua perpetuo cura infandique labores,
Omnibus heu terris iterati, atque omne per æquor,
Totque malis luctata super tua mitis imago
Me desiderio confectam miscuit umbris.
Jamque vale! his terris æterno vere beatis
Nostri, nec nimium, memor, ut potiare relicto."
Proruo in amplexus; turbataque lumina fletu
Nil circum inveniunt nisi cedrum atramque cupressum,
Et foliis raris canam prope litus olivam,
Et lacrimis madidam sopito cespitis herbam.
Verum aliquid, veluti capitis præsentia cari,
Restat, adhuc thalami vox per-onat ultima, flosque
Crinis adhuc solitæ dulcedinis halat odorem.

This apparition is no other than Circe herself, who being enamoured of Ulysses, had employed this artifice for the purpose of gratifying her wishes, and with success.

When, after the expiration of a year, Ulysses determines on returning to Ithaca, Circe, as a last resort, assumes the form of his guardian goddess, and attempts to dissuade him from his purpose. Minerva, justly offended at this presumption, descends in person, and dissolves the enchantment. The description reminds us of the similar passages in Tasso and Ariosto.

Non tulit ulterius Tritonia, dumque petebam
(Quum nihil abrepta jam conjuge reslet a thori)
Laertæ liceat solam fulcire senectam,
Ex templo ante oculos cælo descendit aperto
Atque ita gorgoneis terroribus aspera virgo.

“Tu poteras impune aliam simulare figuram
Quamlibet e superis, inhonestam casside frontem
Aut tegere impurum sub Palladis ægide pectus,
Hoc antiqua Themis vetuit, genitorque deorum:
Nunc igitur, quoniam tibi fœdera rupta fatiscunt
Queis cruda superas mortalia sacula vita,
Parte lues pœnas; licet omnia demere, nolo;
Nudos linquo annos inopi solamque senectam.”
Dixerat, et liquida sublata evanuit aura.
Quæ modo visa mihi est forma superare Minervam
Fit subito indecoris, vox indignata sonorem
Perdidit, utque nihil miserandum aut molle maneret,
Nedum flere diti: quassis penetralibus aer
Tinget, et antra silent matutinæque volucres,
Et viæ egressæ trans atria, rupibus altis
Ecce hederæque cadunt et adusto palmitæ vites.
Obstupro visis equidem aversamque Minervam
Mente hærente voco, nam oblita aut nescia nostri
Me neque diva semel respexit lumine glauco
Nec tuum sustinui propioreni sistere divam.
Multæ animo volvens decedo lumine tristi,
Solus, inops, amens, dubius quo flectere cursum
Ire tamen certus; celer ipso sanguinis æstu
Et sitibundus eram, laticem libet ire perennem,
Itur, at ante pedes fons aruit iste perennis
Et limosa nigris contabuit unda lacunis.

We have next an episode on the subject of Polypheme. The particulars of Ulysses' return are related after Homer; the circumstance of Telemachus essaying to draw his father's bow, on the day of the contest, (Od. Φ . 101. sqq.) gives occasion to a fine and truly heroic incident:

Ista luce quidem fatale haud abfore telum
Rebar, at abstinui natum prædicta monere
Ne minus hinc primus evadat strenuus armis.

He then recounts his motives for leaving his country,

and the artifice by which he concealed his determination from Penelope.

Tam facilem falsis ubi vidi credere verbis,
 Quod cupi, insolitus præcordia perculit angor,
 Arreptaque manu silui fleuque, repressit
 Voce novos luctus citiusque revertere jussit.
 Hei mihi! culpa fuit culpam evitare volenti.
 Illam ego decepi qua me nec mente scellit,
 Illam ego deservi quæ me sequeretur ad umbras!

Finding his friend's depression of spirits to increase daily, Diomed sends a message to Ithaca, unknown to Ulysses, to request the company of Penelope, who of course immediately complies with the summons. Her voyage is thus described.

————— jam veli tumescunt,
 Alliditque ratem nutantem argutior unda,
 Sollicitæque deos ventorum carmin e nauta
 Prospicit immensum pelagus videt anxia conjux,
 Respicit heic cauo subsidunt aquore colles,
 Mittit ibi exiguos a litore victima fumos:
 Tum lacrimæ, cara demum tellure relicta,
 Sive viri optati spe prætrepidante videndi
 Sive ortæ juvenis miti pietate, cadebant
 Mox animum requies quædam confusa silenti
 Occupat, inversi splendescunt marmora cœli,
 Puppis plausa freto prolabitur, inque minutas
 Perpetuis guttis lux aurea depluit undas;
 Visa tamen cupidæ post paucas tardior horas
 Ire ratis, lucque aliquid candoris abesse.

We must not omit her introduction to Diomed.

Regius occursans venientibus instupet hospes,
 Utque videt propior, liceatne obtendere dextram
 Cui supra mortale aliquid præluceat honesta
 Fronte, gradusque regit fiducia recta pudicos,
 Ha ret, et immotus figit vestigia terra,
 Credit adesse deam, clypeumque hastamque requirit,
 Deque secutura tremit edere conjuge vocem.
 Ut tandem humanum produunt suspiria pectus,
 Dulchius errorem nil dissimulavit amico,
 "At tua, Penelope! clamat, dum spirat Ulysses,
 Tydides dum sceptrâ gerit, dum fasque nefasque
 Succerunt superum pater aut mortalia curat,
 Non hasta est pietas caritura nec ægide virtus."

The poem concludes with the fulfilment of the prophecy, in the death of Ulysses by the hand of Telegonus, his son by Circe.

The transition from Mr. Landor's heroics to his hendecasyllabics is like passing from a rough road to a smooth well-trimmed bowling-green. In this species of

composition he succeeds incomparably better, or at least more uniformly, than in the last; his diction is more pure, his style more easy and finished. . He is evidently a master in this metre; nor do we know any one of modern times who has approached nearer to the ancient models. Catullus, to whom this species of verse owes its perfection, was indisputably the most Grecian of all the Latin poets; and the life and elasticity, which he infused into this his favorite measure, are more allied to the tone of Greek than of Latin poetry. Its elegance, its playful sarcasm, the felicities of expression which belong peculiarly to it, and almost constitute its essence, are here displayed in an extraordinary degree. The "Carmina" are fifty-three in number. They are on all subjects; moral, panegyrical, descriptive, satirical, and amatory. A short preface is added, containing among other things the following sweeping sentence on the modern writers of hendecasyllabics,

Aliorum, præterquam Fieri nostri, difficile est unum phaleucium perlegere, ob nimias et lassulas verborum ac versuum repetitiores, quas pro facetiis hunc metro convenientibus usurpant. Fugerem effusos istos, qui, si puerorum ab agmine Trojana, recursus atque velitationes: auxilia non vocarem quæ nihil conferunt nisi strepitum et pulverem et sterilitatem.

Carm. I. is addressed "Ad Apollinem Palatinum."

Qui mulces homines deosque cantu,
Centum nominibus vocatus, audi,
Palatine! superique dedicatæ
A tausto Paphæ nepote divæ
Adsta fragmina porticus, Apollo!
Roman, si licitum peto, revise,
Et fac, scripta mea irrigans ut olim
Puro Pegasei liquore fontis,
Ne tot deperisse conquerantur
Vatum, qui cuperent novos perire
Et præsentia posthabent ademptis;
Musa-que Ausonia a suis relictæ
Illa arbos ruminatis, haud maligna
Parca, frondibus integris resurgat.

The next, "Ad Comum," is a comparison of the ancient eminence of the city of Como, "sedes veterum superba vatum," with its present degradation. The conclusion is as follows:

Quare pro meritis, tibi tuisque,
Natis servitio, insolentibusque
Quando accesserit hospes eruditus
Hos quem noveris improbare mores,
Dî dent tempus in omne, ne resurgat
Laudes Caecilii meicens Catulli,

At vos sitis ut estis, et propagent
 Quales vidimus et videmus isti
 Reges quos celebratis, imperique
 Externi rigor acrius rigescat :
 Descendensque, vel hac via vel illa,
 Nostris vocibus excret viator
 Fissa mœnia dirutasque turres.

Carm. 3. is addressed to Robert Southey, on the loss of his son. The four lines beginning "Si tanta abstulit," strike us as particularly beautiful.

Heu patrum optime, quanta perdidisti
 Vita commoda, filio vocato
 Illuc unde homini nefas redire !
 At scis qui vocat esse redditurum
 Detersis lacrymis in omne seculum.
 Si tanta abstulit auferetque paucis,
 Paucis, quod superat tibi, reliquit . .
 Sublime ingenium, probos amicos,
 Et domum unanimam laud dolore solo.
 Fles natum pater, atque fles acerbe :
 Mox tecum reputes, pius tenerque
 Quanto flet acerbius parentem
 Et solatia quæ forent adempti !
 Non ut parcius hunc minusve amanter
 Tandem respicias rogo aut probarem,
 Sed suave alloquium venustaque ora,
 Quæ natura dabat, sinas perisse,
 Et quodcumque dare assolet juventæ,
 Impertita licet minore cura.
 Tu, quodcumque erat unico his in annis,
 Doctrinæ bona sanctitudinemque
 Morum, qua melius probentur esse
 Jam ducas utinam, petoque, Suther !
 Fama pars ea magna sunt paternæ,
 Perennique perenniora fama.

We confess ourselves unable, after repeated perusals, fully to understand the concluding lines.—**Carm. 4.** will serve as a specimen of our author's invectives. He has certainly read Catullus to some purpose. Of Messrs. Taunton, Jervis, Fellowes, and the other objects of his indignation, we know nothing.

Carmani capita hostium reportant,
 Inquam faucibus extrahunt, suisque
 Tantum regibus amicisque amicis
 Has unquam sapidas dapes ministrant.
 TAUNTO, si tua lingua contigisset
 Impræsi labium extremum tyranni
 A certamine vesperi voracis,
 "Proh divum atque hominum fidem !" boaret,
 Ecquid porrigitis? date exta vulpis
 Qui lento interiit macer veneno,

Expostive lupi reſixa crura
Et muſcis rediſſa vermibusque,
Gingivam vetulæ ſenſive teſtis . .
Auferre hanc olim obſcuro ferinam.
Heus! ſi quis canis id quod auferatur,
Si quis forte voraverit, catena
Cives firmius hunc tenete ferrea ;
Idem diis ſacer eſto ! abominandum
Monſtrum dein puteal tegat perenne.

The next is a tribute of eulogy to the climate of Italy. We all remember Lord Byron's lines on the ſun of Greece—

Not as in northern climes obſcurely bright,
But one unbounded blaze of living light!

Mr. Landor has expreſſed the ſame with remarkable felicity in a ſingle line :

• Heic namque Auſoniæ benignus altor,
Cujus effigiem videmus unam,
Pallentem nebula imbribusve ſadam,
Splendet lumen puriore Titan.

Carm. 8. is a very pretty addreſs to a young lady, who had denied him her company at Chriſtmas :

Hec quam difficile, optimis Decembri
Festis, parte animæ optima carere!
At quum juſſeris obſequar neceſſe eſt
Toto quidnam aliud tenore vitæ
Ac pati aſpera me ſoles jubere?
Vitæ quidnam aliud tenore toto
Iſtis oppoſui ac meros amores?
Haud unam, ipſa fateberis, querelam.
Perge, atque utlibet adde. perferemus:
Nam quum deſieris jubere quidquam,
Audibis, ſed erit brevis, querelam,
Tuque ſerius . . ah nimis ! dolebis.

“Un ſonnet ſans défaut,” ſays Boileau, “vaut ſeul un long poëme :” Carm. 13, “Ad Clementinam,” if Mr. Landor had written nothing elſe, would entitle him to a diſtinguiſhed place among modern Latin poets. It is truly exquiſite.

Clementina venuſta, ſos pudoris,
Quæ divas pietate vincis ipſas
Dum coram celebrant ſuum parentem,
En unquam invenies calore dignum
Quo, ſi tangere cor ſinis, caſceſcas!
Si quem olim ſimilem tui putabis
Clementina, poteſque . . nam ſequacem
Te modestia ſæpius feſellit
Quam ſuperbia ceteras puellas.
Si, mortalibus omnibus priorem

Forma, pectore, sanctitate vitæ,
 Tu mortalibus omnibus priorem
 Tuo reddere non neges amore,
 An quæso erga homines deosve possit
 Justis officiis ut ante fungi?
 Numquid sit reliqui quod ille tantus
 Infra respiciat colatve supra?
 Sæpe te puduit tui decoris,
 Tum vero nimis nimis pigebit.

Carm. 44. is addressed "Ad Suthæium, quum interciderant [intercidissent] epistolæ." We do not understand the allusion in the last line.

Suthæi, quis tibi me minus probavit,
 Ut non amplius aut novum pocina
 Mittas, aut quid ut ante literarum?
 Te, quum desicis me amare, amabo.
 Nam neque est pater aut maritus ullus
 Aut civis melior, neque est poeta
 (Si ternos ego literis tenatis
 Demam) quem tibi comparare fas est.
 Te primum facile optimi fatentur,
 Et vix se tibi pessimi anteponunt . .
 Biscconis venia . . negat! silebo.

Mr. Landor is always at home on Italian subjects; he writes *con amore*, and his intimate knowledge of the country, the literature, and manners of the inhabitants, gives the charm of reality to his delineations.

Carm. 52. is on the death of Bodoni, the celebrated printer of Parma. We extract it for the sake of the subject.

Tuque mortuus es, nec tu sequentum
 Laudes aut lacrymas vides, Bodoni!
 Elegantibus esse qui dedisti
 Cadmi filiolis, Iovisque mensæ
 Digne accumbere cum aureis Camænis,
 Nostros quando erit his datos labores
 Ornati, ut decuit, videre Luto? . .
 Id curent alii . . virum dolemus
 Sublatum ex oculis, probum, innocentem,
 Et desiderio, haud mora, movemur.

We would willingly have quoted the concluding poem, a panegyric on Cardinal Gonsalvi, written in a very noble and manly style; but the quotations have already exceeded our bounds, and we only hope that their intrinsic worth will be some excuse for their prolixity. And here we must stop for the present: Mr. Landor's Essay is so rich in curious and interesting matter, that even a brief notice of it would be utterly incompatible with the limits of the present article. We have to apologise to Mr. Landor for the

inadequacy of this criticism, owing to causes over which we have little control. If we have erred, it is on the side of praise. Mr. Landor's excellences and defects are indeed both so great, and so closely interwoven with each other, that it was difficult to strike the balance between them, or to give due weight to the one without seeming to under-rate the other. The walk of composition which he has chosen is one in which few are interested, and even in this department his merits are rather recondite than palpable, and such as are not likely to be fully appreciated by the less discriminating even of learned readers; he must therefore be contented with the calm and deliberate approbation of a select few; and in this, we are disposed to believe, he will not be disappointed.

We add a notice of certain errors in language, metre, &c. into which the author has fallen; together with other remarks which occurred to us in the course of perusal.

'Pudoris ara,' p. 6, 'mussaret' for 'mussare solebat.' p. 7, 'chorea' for 'choreas.' p. 8, 'indixit' for 'indixerit.' p. 10. l. 14,

'Mater,' ait Helena. 'Crudelior,' &c.

We should prefer *Helene*. In p. 12, the first syllable of *retulisse* is made short, and so in other passages. 'Sponsalia Polyxenæ,' p. 16, Arg. 'prædicat, for 'prædicit.' p. 21, 'Sigæia,' and 'Cytheron.' The latter reminds us of a line in Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*, in which topography and prosody are curiously confounded. *Palamon* is invoking *Venus*: p. 23, 'accessit Phthiæ.'

Thou gladder of the Mount of Cytheron—

'Dryope,' p. 24, Arg. 'in sinum locaret,' for 'in sinu.' Same page, 'velit' for 'vult.' ib. l. 8, 10, 13, and on various other occasions, a single substantive is joined with two adjectives, in such a manner as to produce a disagreeable effect: c. g.

In salicæ cano pubentes flore novellas—

'Corythus,' p. 32, 'Ad portam palare senem videt.' We believe *palari* only is used, and always of more than one. P. 34, the passages quoted in the note as from II. Z. and E. are both in Z. sc. l. 242, and 313. P. 37, 'Eetionæas.' ib. 'audierim,' apparently for 'audiissem.' ib. 'ab mensa' for 'a mensa.' P. 45, 'tramiteque' we think is not sufficiently elegant. 'Pan et Pitys,' p. 51, the first syllable in 'fragmentibus,' we believe, is invariably long. p. 52, (and similarly p. 55, l. 7—9)

Ut properata tuis aliquando incendia regnis
Irruerint, fremereutque fero nemora alta fragore.

'Coresus et Callirhoë,' p. 51, 'pudor irruit igneus ori.'
 P. 55,

—— dum lumina lassa quietem
Quarebant, vigili dum mens arrecta dolori
Plaudere sentiret revocata conjuge manes.

P. 57, 'vero' for 'tamen.' We know not whether this passage was suggested by the xxviiith chapter of Job: 'Surely there is a vein for the silver,' &c.

—— largi sua præmia reges
 Obtendant, pelago sint explorata profundo,
 Sint terris effossa, viros quæcunque minores
 Insignire solent, reliquo miracula vulgo;
 Dii vero ingenium soli formamque dedere
 De cælo, nulloque intercipiente ministro.

P. 59, 8, 'conscia rerum,' conscious of what was passing.—'Catillus et Salia,' p. 61,

—— horret equus ——
 Interdum obscuris visis gemituque ferarum,
 Interdum aut lapsu de subere corticis atii,
 Crisporum et crebro foliorum in fræna rotatu.

P. 63, 'tunc' is used in a sense which belongs to 'tunc' exclusively. 'Pomœria,' p. 63, and 'sacellum,' 64, seem to us below the dignity of the heroic style. Ib.

Quum—tenuis cœli tractus vix luce ruberet
 Sub nebula, necdum varios distingueret agros.

This reminds us of a magnificent simile in Count Julian:

As oftentimes an eagle, when the sun
 Throws on the varying earth his early ray,
 Stands solitary, stands immoveable
 Upon some mountain height, and rolls his eyes,
 Clear, constant, unobservant, unabased,
 In the cold light, above the dews of morn.

P. 68, .

Fatur, et ingentem trans flumina conjicit hastam.

We believe there is no instance of *fatur* being used in this absolute manner, immediately following a speech. Ib.

Proflans elatis curvas cervicibus undas.

We think the arrangement of this, as of many other lines, might be altered with advantage. P. 71, 'exigerent' for 'exigere volunt' or 'vellent.' This is a favorite usage with

Mr. Landor; we doubt whether it is justifiable in many of the places where he has employed it. P. 72, 'potimur.' We quote a line in the same page, and another in p. 73, as instances of the occasional ruggedness of Mr. Landor's verses.

Dextraque ascendit bene noto tramite sylvam.

En pater! in saxum obtutu indurescere primo—

P. 76, 'ōmiscris.'—'Veneris Pueri,' p. 77,

—vocari

Idaliū jubet atque senem decernere litem.

We should prefer 'lites,' to avoid the collision of the three independent accusatives, all ending in the same manner. P. 78, 'repulisset.'—'Ulysses in Argirippa,' p. 89, 'Polymnestore' for 'Polymestore;' perhaps a slip of the pen. P. 91, 'nollet' for 'noluisset.' ib. 'Læstrigonas' for 'Læstrygonas.' P. 92, 'tunicam virentem,' for 'viridem;' is this correct? or was 'forest-green' the costume of the Dryads? ib. 'redire conjugibus' for 'redire ad conjuges.' P. 94,

*Quæ mala non mihi sum visus meruisse? quibusque
Suppliciis, quotquot Rhadamanthus et Æacus urgent
Sub Plutone, parem me non fore rebar avorum?*

i. e. 'quibus avorum, quotquot, &c. parem me non fore rebar suppliciis?' a harsh construction, not to mention the juxtaposition of 'quibusque' and 'suppliciis.' P. 95,

Et lacrymæ (fassis ignosce) per ora profusæ.

We doubt whether an *ancient* hero would have thought it necessary to apologise for shedding tears. P. 96, 'seu—ve,' for 'seu—sive:'

*Seu Polyphemus aquas vigilaret propter amœnas
Erraret-ve—*

The passage of Virgil which Mr. Landor quotes in vindication of this usage.

Seu crudo fidit pugnam committere cæstu,

Aut jactu incidit melior levibusque sagittis,

is not parallel. Ib. 'audiret' for 'audire solebat,' a frequent usage with Mr. Landor, originating in a particular use of the English 'would.' P. 97, Can the epithet *ater* be applied to *antrum*? Ib. 'Ut acciperet' for 'ut accepit.' We have to complain, in general, of an extreme latitude in the use of this tense, and others nearly related to it. P. 98, 'vertere' for 'avertere.' Ib. note 2, 'facia' for 'facit.' In the next following note, speaking of the story of Polyphemus, which he is relating, the author observes, 'De hoc eventū ad—'

232 Notice of Landor's *Idyllia Heroica*.

huc loquuntur Siculi et Neapolitani, mutato nomine.' P. 103, 'si cupias' for 'si cupis.' Ib. 'redeam,' perhaps by an oversight for 'redibo.' P. 115, 'Quo vento'—would not a Roman writer have preferred 'advento,' 'vento illuc,' or some similar expression, instead of the simple 'vento'?

Carm. 2. 'Cybèles.' Is this admissible?—9,

Rex ————— ministrum

Mandat protinus ad cubantis ædes,

for *mittit*.—12,

Quanta perniciēs loquacis umbræ,

Quanta, in æquora pensilis vireti,

Quanta vitibus Atticæque olivæ, etc.

a confusion of cases.—16, 'Recordatio erat severa,' the recollection was painful.—18, 'curiosus' for 'curious.'—20, (speaking of bookworms),

— qui trepidant suis referre

Quali quisque manu librum exaravit,

Non quid scripserit aut grave aut facctum.

28, 'Quum venerat mihi in mentem,' for 'venisset.' Ib. 'mœniorum.'—33,

Vivæ (uxori sc.), in funere, postque funus ipsum,

Verus, ah satis et super! fuisti.

Is not 'verus' for 'fidus' an Anglicism?

The martyr of his crimes, but true to thee. (Campbell.)

—34, 'gradiri' for 'gradi.'—48,

Cur—me nec mittere nec sinis levare,

Cur—jubeas, etc.

The diphthong æ is likewise frequently substituted for α; as in *amænus*, *tragedia*, &c.

ON

TWO PASSAGES IN VIRGIL'S GEORGICS.

OBSERVING in No. 48. the Remarks of R. on two passages in Virgil's *Georgics*, and not coinciding exactly with the opinions of the writer in the first of his criticisms, I now send you my observations on the subject.

His first observation is, that the verses from G. ii. 38, *Tuque ades*, &c. to the end of the passage, should be inserted

between v. 7. and v. 8. I suppose he means rather between v. 8. and v. 9, for the former period is concluded at v. 8.

He says, the poet first mentions generally his subject, then addresses Bacchus the founder of it; then proceeds to the didactic; and then on a sudden introduces a second address, &c.

But it will be ascertained on examination, that Virgil is quite methodical in his work, and that the lines in their present disposition will be found to be placed in the most natural order.

The poet first proposes his general subject in his exordium: then follows the invocation, where he solicits Bacchus to be present and favorable to his undertaking; he then, in exalted *epic* measure, (not *didactic*) proceeds to state the *general* scheme of his subject under the auspices of the god: and at v. 39, he addresses himself to his patron Mæcenas, still in *epic* measure, to assist him in his design; he then in an orderly manner proceeds to detail in *didactic* poetry the *particular* subject which he had before mentioned *generally* in what may be called his *prospectus*. Thus for instance his first *general epic* precept begins at *Principio sponte sua*, &c.—to this corresponds his first *didactic particular* precept, *Sponte sua quæ*, &c. v. 47. Another general precept is, *Pars surgunt de semine*; to this corresponds *seminibus jactis*; a third general precept is, *pullulat ab radice*; the corresponding *particular* one is, *Quæ stirpibus exit ab imis*; a fourth general is *Sunt alii quos usus*; and this is *particularly* exemplified by what relates to propagation by grafts, layers, inoculation, &c.

The general distribution of the subject therefore follows the *invocation* to a deity; the *particular* one the *address* to a patronising friend.

The other notice of transposition is ingenious, and perhaps would suit as well the new position in which it is placed, had not Virgil thought otherwise.

Different passages often strike persons in different lights; but the genuine effort of criticism should be applied to find out the author's meaning, which must always be considered as a praiseworthy attempt. S.

In DEMOSTHENEM Commentarii JOANNIS SEAGER, Bicknor Wallicæ in Com. Monumethiæ Rectoris.

OLYNTII. i. p. 14. l. 26. ed. Reisk. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς βοηθείας ταῦτα γινώσκω. περὶ δὲ χρημάτων πόρου, ἔστιν, ὃ ἄνδρες, Ἀθηναῖοι,

χρήματα ὑμῖν, ἔστιν, ὅσα οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων στρατιωτικά. ταῦτα δὲ ὑμεῖς οὕτως ὡς βούλεσθε λαμβάνετε. εἰ μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τοῖς στρατευομένοις ἀποδώσετε, οὐδενὸς ὑμῖν προσδεῖ πόρου. εἰ δὲ μὴ, προσδεῖ. μᾶλλον ὁ ἅπαντος ἐνδεῖ τοῦ πόρου. τί οὖν, αἱ τις εἴποι, σὺ γράφεις ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά; μὰ δὲ, οὐκ ἔγωγε. ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι στρατιώτας δεῖν κατασκευασθῆναι, καὶ ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά, καὶ μίαν σύνταξιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτὴν, τοῦ τε λαμβάνειν καὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ δεόντα. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὕτω πως ἄνευ πραγμάτων ταῦτα λαμβάνετε εἰς τὰς ἐορτάς.

χρήματα ista, de quibus sic caute agit orator, sunt τὰ θεωρικά, h. e. omnia reipublice vectigalia. Athenienses enim, initio sumpto a duobus obolis, viritum olim spectaculorum causa eiogatis, vectigalia omnia, a publicis usibus aversa, inter se dividebant; cum mortis pœna sancissent, ne quis ad populum ferret, ut hæc, more pristino restituto, in necessaria ad bellum insumerentur.

Inter se repugnare videntur—"μὰ δὲ, οὐκ ἔγωγε (γράφω ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά)" et "ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι δεῖν ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά." Reiskii interpretatio, si ita scripsisset Demosthenes, "ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ΦΗΜΙ ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά," verbis ejus conveniret: cum "ΗΓΟΥΜΑΙ ΔΕΙΝ ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά" non satis congruit. Melius forsitan legatur, ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι στρατιώτας δεῖν κατασκευασθῆναι, καὶ ΜΙ ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά· καὶ μίαν σύνταξιν—κ. τ. λ.

Non diserte, aperte, (*formaliter*, ut nunc loquimur) censeo, inquit Demosthenes, ut hæc fiant στρατιωτικά. Quod censeo, est, non tam debere hæc fieri στρατιωτικά, quam eos, qui hæc accipiant, fieri debere στρατιώτας. ita et accipiant, ut nunc accipiunt, et simul officiis militaribus fungantur. Legi quoque posset, eodem fere sensu, στρατιώτας δεῖν κατασκευασθῆναι, ΟἷΣ' ταῦτ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά.

Olynth. i. p. 15. l. 11. οὔτε γὰρ, ὡς δοκεῖ, καὶ φήσειέ τις ἄν, μὴ σκοπῶν ἀκριβῶς, εὐτρεπῶς, οὐδ' ὡς ἄν κάλλιστ', αὐτῷ τὰ παρόντ' ἔχει· (ἔφη Reisk. quod miror.) οὗτ' ἄν ἐξήνεγκε τὸν πόλεμόν ποτε τοῦτον ἐκείνος, εἰ πολεμεῖν αἰτήθη δεήσειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ', ὡς ἐπιὼν, ἅπαντα τότε ἤλπιζε τὰ πράγματα ἀναιρήσεσθαι, κατὰ διέψευσται. τοῦτο δὲ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ταραττεῖ παρὰ γνώμην γεγονός, καὶ πολλὴν ἀθυμίαν αὐτῷ παρέχει. Distinguendum videtur:—εἰ πολεμεῖν αἰτήθη δεήσειν αὐτόν. ἀλλ' ὡς, ἐπιὼν, ἅπαντα τότε ἤλπιζε τὰ πράγματα ἀναιρήσεσθαι, κατὰ διέψευσται, τοῦτο δὲ πρῶτον αὐτόν ταραττεῖ, παρὰ γνώμην γεγονός, καὶ π. α. α. π.

Olynth. iii. p. 28. l. 7. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ λόγους περὶ τοῦ τιμωρῆσθαι Φίλιππον ὁρῶ γινομένους. τὰ δὲ πράγματα εἰς τοῦτο προήκοντα ὥστε, ὅπως μὴ πεισώμεθα αὐτοὶ πρότερον κακῶς, σκέψασθαι δεόν.

Melius mihi videtur legere ζεῖν quam subaudire εἶναι.

Olynth. iii. p. 30. l. 1. ἐψηφίσασθε τετταράκοντα τριῆρεις καθέλκειν, καὶ τοὺς μέχρι πέντε καὶ τετταράκοντα ἐτῶν αὐτοὺς ἐμβαίνειν, καὶ τάλαντα ἐξήκοντα εἰσφέρειν. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διελθόντος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τούτου, ἑκατομβαιῶν, μεταγεινιῶν, βοηδρομιῶν· τούτου τοῦ μηνὸς μόγισ, μετὰ τὰ μυστήρια, δέκα ναῦς ἀποστείλατε ἔχοντα Χαρίδημον κενάς, καὶ πέντε τάλαντα ἀργυρίου.

κενάς.] l. e. πολιτικῆς δυνάμεως κενάς. Nam cives Athenienses, quum Philippum vel ægrotum, vel mortuum audissent, periculo jam se defunctos rati, et propterea conscendere ipsi nolentes, naves Charidemo militibus alibi complendas tradiderunt.

Olynth. iii. p. 33. l. 28. ἀλλ', οἶμαι, μέγα τοῖς τοιούτοις ὑπάρχει λόγους ἢ πορ' ἐκάστου βούλησις.

τοῖς τοιούτοις λόγοις] Interrogationibus scilicet an non, τοῖς θεωρικῶς intactis, pecunia bello confici posset.

Philipp. i. p. 40. l. 10. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀθυμητέον, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς παροῦσι πράγμασιν, οὐδ' εἰ πάνυ φαύλως ἔχειν δοκεῖ. ὁ γὰρ ἐστὶ χεῖριστον αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ παρεληλυθότος χρόνου, τοῦτο πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα βέλτιστον ὑπάρχει. τί οὖν ἐστὶ τοῦτο; ὅτι οὐδὲν, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῶν δεόντων ποιούντων ὑμῶν, κακῶς τὰ πράγματα ἔχει. ἐπίτιοιγε, εἰ πάνθ' ἃ προσῆκε πρᾶττόντων οὕτως εἶχεν, οὐδ' ἂν ἐλπίς ἦν αὐτὰ βελτίω γενέσθαι.

“ Sequitur ratio omnium maxima ad faciendam spem; nempe ex eironibus temporis præteriti, et viarum adhuc tentatarum. Optima enim est ea reprehensio, quam de statu civili haud prudenter administrato quispiam his verbis complexus est:—Quod ad præteritum pessimum est, id ad futura optimum videri debet. Si enim vos omnia, quæ ad officium vestrum spectant, præstitissetis, neque tamen res vestræ in meliore loco essent, ne spes quidem ulla reliqua foret, eas in melius provehi posse. Sed cum rerum vestrarum status, non a vi ipsa rerum, sed ab erroribus vestris male se habeat; sperandum est, illis erroribus missis aut correctis, magnam rerum in melius mutationem fieri posse.” Bacon. Nov. Organ. lib. i. Aph. 94.

Argum. Orat. de Pace. p. 56. l. 15. κατηγορῶν γὰρ ὁ ῥήτωρ Αἰσχίνου, καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοῦ διαβάλλει, ὅτι συνεβούλευε Φίλιππον ἀμφικτύονα εἶναι ψηφίσασθαι, μηδενὸς ἄλλου τολμᾶν τοῦτο εἰσηγήσασθαι, μηδὲ Φιλοκράτους τοῦ πάντων ἀναιδιστάτου.—Locus est, Περὶ Παραπρ. p. 375. l. 16.

Ibid.—l. 22. ἀλλὰ δηλονότι τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ἔδεισε, μὴ δόξῃ φιλιππίζειν, καὶ χρήμασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως πεισθεὶς τοιαύτην γνώμην ἀποφῆναι. His verbis ostendere vult Libanius cur orationem hanc De Pace non egerit Demosthenes.

De Pace. p. 61. l. 12.—καὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν (Atheniensibus) κρεί-

νοις (Thebanis) τοὺς βοηθήσαντας ἂν οἶομαι, εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν εἶ τις ἐμβάλοι, βοηθεῖν, οὐ συνεπιστρατεύσειν οὐδετέροις. καὶ γὰρ αἱ συμ-
μαχίαι τοῦτον ἔχουσι τὸν τρόπον, ὥν καὶ φροντίσειεν ἂν τις, καὶ τὸ
πράγμα φύσει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν. οὐκ ἄχρη τῆς ἴσης ἕκαστός ἐστιν εὐνους
οὐδ' ἡμῖν οὔτε Θηβαίοις,* σῶς τε εἶναι καὶ κρατεῖν τῶν ἄλλων· ἀλλὰ
σῶς μὲν εἶναι ἅπαντες ἂν βούλιντο ἕνεκά γε ἑαυτῶν, κρατήσαντας δὲ
τοὺς ἑτέρους δεσπύτας ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἷς.

Ita legenti putandum erit ἄχρι τῆς ἴσης significare (quod tamen
significare non potest) idem quod ἐπίσης, h. e. *Jualu, Pariter*.
ἄχρι τῆς ἴσης, est, *Eousque dum pares simus*. Lego igitur:
οὐκ, *Et MI* ἄχρι τῆς ἴσης, ἕκαστός ἐστιν εὐνους οὐδ' ἡμῖν οὔτε
Θηβαίοις· *ΟΥΔ' ὍΜΟΙΩΣ ΒΟΥΛΕΤΑΙ* σῶς τε εἶναι καὶ κρατεῖν
τῶν ἄλλων. *Et nobis, et Thebanis, ita facit unusquisque, ut
aequalitatis terminos nec nos nec illos migrare cupiat: neque
salvos esse jura vult atque in elios dominari.*

De Pace. p. 63. l. 25. οὐκ οὖν εὐηθες καὶ κομιδῇ σχέτιον, πρὸς
ἐκάστους καθ' ἓνα οὕτως ἤδη προσενηγεμένους περὶ τῶν οἰκείων καὶ
ἀναγκαιοτάτων, πρὸς ἅπαντας τερεὶ τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς σκιᾶς νυκὶ πολεμή-
σαι. Sedem in Amphictyonum consensu umbram appellat Ora-
tor; rem contentione non dignam, cum ab eo tenenda esset, qui
jam ante tantam potentiam consecutus fuisset. Atqui, hac
umbrā concessa, veterator ille Philippus auctoritatem viribus
addere, legibusque et decretis scelerata consilia adjuvare, spe-
rabat.

De Halones. p. 86. l. 24. Χερρόνησου οἱ ὄροι εἰσιν οὐκ ἀγορά,
ἀλλ' ὁ βωμὸς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὀρίου· ὅς ἐστι μετὰ ξυ Πτελεοῦ καὶ Λευκῆς
ἀκτῆς, οὗ ἡ διωρυχὴ ἐμελλε Χερρόνησου ἔσεσθαι, ὥς γε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα
τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὀρίου δηλοῖ. ἐστὶ δὲ τοῦτ'·

Τόνδε καθιδρύσαντο θεῶν περικαλλέα βωμόν,

Λευκῆς καὶ Πτελεοῦ μέσσον ὄρον θέμενοι,

Ἐνναίεται χώρης, σημείον· ἀμμορίης δὲ

Αὐτὸς ἀναξ μακάρων ἐστὶ μέσος κρονίδης.

“ἀμμορία] Immortalitas: illa conditio, quae μέσῳ, necessitate
fatali occidendi, percundi, caret,—pro ἀμορία.” Reiske. in
indice Gracit. Dem.

Jovem immortalitatis μέσον esse, quid ad argumentum hujus
epigrammatis faciat, me non intelligere fateor. Legendum
puto:

ἀμορίης δὲ

Αὐτὸς ἀναξ μακάρων ἐστὶ μέσος κρονίδης.

ἀμορία est, Confinium.—Ara Jovis inter Leucam et Pteleum
posita, Jupiter ipse, per figuram, medium confinium tenere
dicitur.

De rebus Chersonesi. p. 96. l. 20 οὐδὲν οὖν ἄλλο ποιοῦσιν οἱ

κατηγοροῦντες ἐν ὑμῖν ἢ προλέγουσιν ἄποσι, μηδοτιοῦν ἐκ-ίνῳ διδόναι, αἷς καὶ τοῦ μελλῆσαι δάσονται δίκην, μήτι ποιήσαντί γε ᾗ συγκαταπρα-
ξαμένῳ.

τοῦ μελλῆσαι] Vid p. 95. l. 24.

De rebus Chersonesi. p. 96. l. 22. τοῦτ' εἰσὶν οἱ λόγοι· μέλλει πολιορκεῖν. τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐκδίδωσι· μέλει γάρ τινι τούτων τῶν τὴν Ἀσίαν οἰκούντων Ἑλλήνων. ἀμείνους μέντ' ἂν εἴεν τῶν ἄλλων ἢ τῆς πατρίδος κήδεσθαι.

ΙΟΥ. ΤΟΙΟΥΤΟΙ εἰσὶν οἱ λόγοι·—μέλλει πολιορκεῖν,—τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐκδίδωσι· μέλει γάρ τινι τούτων τῶν τὴν Ἀσίαν οἰκούντων Ἑλλήνων; (sic Himerogenes.) ἀμείνους μέντ' ἂν—κ τ. λ.

Post τινι subaud. ὑμῶν.—Does any one of you then care about the Greeks who inhabit Asia?

Truly, were that the case, they (who interest themselves about the Asiatic Greeks) would take much more care of others than of their own country.

Sequitur, καὶ τότε εἰς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἐκπέμπειν ἕτερον στρατηγὸν, τοῦτ' ἐστίν. εἰ γὰρ σκεῖν ποιεῖ Διοπτέλης καὶ καταγεῖν τὰ πλοῖα, μικρὸν, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μικρὸν πινάκιον ταῦτα πάντα κωλύσαι δύναται ἂν. καὶ λεγούσιν οἱ νόμοι ταῦτα, τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας εἰσαγγέλλειν, οὐ μὰ Δί', οὐ δαπάναις καὶ τριήρεσιν τοσαύταις ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς φυλάττειν· ἐπεὶ τοῦτό γ' ἐστὶν ὑπερβολὴ μανίας.

τοῦτ' ἐστίν] ἐστὶν μιο ἐξέστιν, Iacut.—Mittre etiam alium ducem,—hoc quoque in vestra potestate est. Melius hoc quam Diopitheim hic convicis vanis successis, illic tantis sumtibus tam multis navibus custodire.

Aliter accipiunt Wolfius et Reiskius; sed perperam, ut mihi videtur. Ironiam, quam hic esse putat Wolfius, nullam cerno. Secundum Reiskii interpretationem inconsequentia esset: nam quomodo cohaerent haec—*Huc tendunt adversariorum criminationes. Submoto Diopithe, suffectum eunt alium imperatorem.* Si ENIM indigna facit Diopithes, et naves deducit, eum ad reatum revocare potestis,—(duce alio suffecto, quod necesse fuisse?) Particulā καίτοι, non γὰρ, usus esset Demosthenes, si id quod opinatur Reiskius dicere voluisset.—Addit Orator, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, οὓς οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν ὑπὸ τοῖς νόμοις, καὶ στρατιώτας τρέφειν, καὶ τριήρεις ἐκπέμπειν, καὶ χρήματα εἰσφέρειν δεῖ, καὶ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν· ἐπὶ δ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ψήφισμα, εἰσαγγελία, πάραλος. ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἱκανά· ταῦτ' ἦν εὐ φρονούντων ἀνθρώπων, ἐπιρροαζόντων δὲ καὶ διαφθειρόντων τὰ πράγματα, ἃ νῦν οὗτοι ποιοῦσι. quae priora illa, καὶ τότε εἰς τ. E. e. e. σ., ποῦτ' ἐστίν, illustrant.

De rebus in Chersoneso. p. 99. l. 3. ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος μὲν (Φίλιππος) ὑμῶν οἴκοι μερόντων, σχολὴν ἀγόντων, ὑγιαίνοντων, (εἰ δὲ τοὺς τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντας ὑγιαίνειν φῆσαι) οὐ μὲν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ κατέστησε

τυράννους· τὸν μὲν ἀπαντικρὺ τῆς ἀττικῆς ἐπιτειχίσας, τὸν δ' ἐπὶ Σκιάθῳ. ὑμεῖς δ' οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἀπελύσασθε, εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο ἐβούλεσθε. ἀλλ' εἰάκατε, καὶ ἀφέστατε δηλονότι αὐτῶ.

Rescribendum proculdubio, ὑμεῖς δ' οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἈΠΕΚΩΛΥΨΑΣΘΕ,—κ. τ. λ.

De rebus in Chersoneso. p. 108. l. 26. τὰ μὲν ἔργα παρ' ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ζητεῖτε· τὰ δὲ βέλτιστα ἐπιστήμῃ λέγειν παρὰ τοῦ παριόντος.

“Accipi fortasse potest pro ἐπιστημόνως. Sed malim hunc locum sic legere; τὸ ὅτι τὰ βέλτιστα λέγειν παρὰ, omisso nomine ἐπιστήμῃ, et τὸ articulo addito.” Wolf.—“ἐπιστήμῃ λέγειν τὰ βέλτιστα ζητεῖτε παρὰ τοῦ παριόντος. ut optima quaeque vobis suadeat, eaque, quae suadeat, certissime cognita et respecta habeat, usu suo, fama, meditatione, viis aliis quibuscumque verum exploratur.” Reiske in indice.

Legi possit ἐπιστήμην, ut constructio sit, παρὰ δὲ τοῦ παριόντος (ζητεῖτε) ἐπιστήμην (τοῦ) λέγειν τὰ βέλτιστα.

In Philippum iii. p. 127. l. 1. Quum Oreum Philippo prodendi consilium inissent Oritæ quidam, Euphræum, qui rem coarguerat, in carcerem condi passus est populus, proditoribus sine poena dimissis. Urbs itaque mox prodita est. τῆς δὲ πόλεως οὕτως ἀλούσης αἰσχυρῶς καὶ κακῶς, οἱ μὲν (proditores sc.) ἀρχοῦσι καὶ τυραννοῦσι τοὺς τότε σώζοντας αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὸν Εὐφραῖον, εἰσέτοιμους ὅτιοῦν ποιεῖν ὄντας, τοὺς μὲν ἐκβαλόντες· τοὺς δὲ ἀποκτείναντες.

Scribendum et distinguendum,—οἱ μὲν ἀρχοῦσι καὶ τυραννοῦσι τοὺς τότε σώζοντας αὐτοὺς, (illos quorum opera incolumes conservati fuissent, quum accusasset Euphræus,) καὶ τὸν Εὐφραῖον εἰσέτοιμους ὅτιοῦν ποιεῖν ὄντας· (eosdem illos qui nihil non in Euphræum maleficii admittere parati essent:) τοὺς μὲν ἐκβαλόντες, τ. δ. α.—Alludit ad illa supra, p. 126. l. 16. ὁρῶν δὲ ταῦθ' ὁ δῆμος ὁ τῶν ἀρεϊτῶν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, τῷ μὲν (Euphræo) βοηθεῖν, τοὺς δ' (proditores) ἀποτυμπανίσαι· τοῖς μὲν οὐκ ἀργίζετο, τὸν δ' ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι ταῦτα παθεῖν ἔφη, καὶ ἐπέχαιρε.

Hujus loci sensum nec Wolfius nec Reiskius cepit. id quod ex illius nota, ex hujus interpunctione, manifestum est.—“τυραννοῦσι absolute accipiendum, inquit Wolfius, quod sequitur,—τοὺς τότε σώζοντας—pro τῶν τότε σωζόντων αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν Εὐφραῖον, εἰσέτοιμους ὄντας ὅτιοῦν ποιεῖν, &c. τοὺς μὲν. Imperant: eos, qui tunc (cum urbs oppugnaretur) et se tuebantur, id est defendebant patriam, et Euphræum, id est vinculis liberabant; qui pro defensione patriæ nullum periculum recusabant, partim ejecerunt, partim occiderunt.”

In Philippum iii. p. 128. l. 13. μωρία καὶ κακία τὰ τοιαῦτα

ἐλπίζειν, καὶ κακῶς βουλευομένους αὐτοὺς, καὶ μηδὲν, ὧν προσήκει, ποιεῖν ἐθέλοντας· ἀλλὰ τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν λεγόντων ἀκροαμένους, τηλικαύτην ἡγεῖσθαι πόλιν οἰκεῖν τὸ μέγεθος, ὥστε, μηδ', ἂν ὀτιοῦν ᾗ, δεινὸν πείσεσθαι. Nunquam, quod sciam, vox δεινὸς per se τῷ πάσχειν adjungitur, nisi in plurali numero. Malim igitur,— ὥστε μηδὲν, ἂν ὀτιοῦν ᾗ, δεινὸν πείσεσθαι.—vel, ὥστε μηδὲν, μηδ' ἂν ὀτιοῦν ᾗ, δεινὸν πείσεσθαι.

In Philippum iv. p. 132. l. 18. οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου προαιρέσεως, οἱ τυραννίδων καὶ δυναστειῶν ἐπιθυμοῦντες, κεκρατήκασι πανταχοῦ. ἐκείνου] Philippi.

SYMBOLÆ CRITICÆ

IN QUEDAM LOCA PLATONIS ET HORATII.

IN Apologia Sociatis, quam Astius quidem, Vir perdoctus et admodum sagax, Platoni, ut historicus nescio cujus abortum, fidenter abjudicavit, qua tamen etiam posthac plurimi iique non insipientes fruentur ut vera Socratis defensione per Platonem pie tradita, passim quidem, ni fallor, tradentis ingenio tum juvenili imprudenter immutata, in egregia igitur illa Oratione et Socratica et Platonica, cap. xxiii. extr. in codd. atque editt. ver., etiam in edd. Stephani, Fischeri, Wolfii, Beckii, ὑμᾶς legitur in his : Ταῦτα γὰρ, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὔτε ὑμᾶς χρεὶ ποιεῖν τοὺς δοκοῦντας καὶ ὀπητιοῦν τι (nam ὀπητιοῦν τι malim cum Bekkero pro ὀπητιοῦν, quod est apud Stephanum, Fischerum, Wolfium, Beckium, et pro ὀπηοῦν τι, quod scripsit Heindorfius) εἶναι, οὐτ' ἂν ἡμεῖς ποιῶμεν, ὑμᾶς ἐπιτρέπειν κ. τ. λ. Alii tamen recentiorum prætulerunt, quod conjecit, in Textum recipere ausus non est, Forsterus, ἡμᾶς : Jo. Henr. Vossius, Schleiermacherus, Heindorfius, Bekkerus. Schleiermacherus quidem trifariam nos cogi dicit ad hanc lectionem amplectendam, tum proximo ἡμεῖς, tum sequenti ὑμᾶς, tum simili oppositione in illis (cap. 24) : οὔτε ἡμᾶς ἐθίζειν ὑμᾶς ἐπιτορκεῖν, οὐδ' ὑμᾶς ἐθίζεσθαι, quam Vossius jam vocaverat in auxilium. Neque tamen his omnibus quidquam proficitur. Manifesta quidem his locis oppositio reorum et judicum; rei sunt ἡμεῖς, judices ὑμεῖς. At si in iudicum numero nonnulli esse videntur, qui, ipsi quondam capitis rei, iidem suppliciter oraverint iudices tunc suos cum lacrymis aliaque turpiter fecerint ad misericordiam movendam : quidni optimo sane jure dicere poterat Socrates : οὐτ' ὑμᾶς χρεὶ ποιεῖν κ. τ. λ.?

Quidni, etiamsi minime præniserit quod illi volunt, ἡμᾶς, sine ulla hæsitacione addere hæc : οὐτ' ἂν ἡμεῖς ποιῶμεν, ὑμᾶς ἐπιτρέπειν—? Atqui ejusmodi homines inter Socratis iudices videri fuisse, apertum est ex initio capitis : τάχα δ' ἂν τις ὑμῶν ἀγανακτήσειεν, ἀναμνησθεὶς ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ ὁ μὲν καὶ ἐλάττω τουτοῦ τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἀγωνιζόμενος, δεδέηται τε καὶ ἰκέτευε τοὺς δικαστὰς μετὰ πολλῶν δακρύων, παιδίᾳ τε αὐτοῦ ἀναβιβασάμενος, ἵνα ὅτι μάλιστα ἐλεηθεῖν κ τ. λ. Temere igitur h. l. vulgatam deseruit Heindorfius, auctore Forstero, ducibus et comitibus duumviris eximiis, Vossio et Schleiermachero.

Apol. c. xxix. verba ἐμὲ τεθνάναι δὴ delevit Wolfius, retinuit Heindorfius scribens τὸ ε. τ. δ. Glossam omnino sapere mihi videntur, deleta etiam Bekkero, haud scio an ex codicum auctoritate. Capite xxvii. contra Heindorfius cum Schleiermachero e margine iniepsisse censet verba τοῖς Ἐνδεκα, quæ retinuit Wolfius, uncis inclusit Bekkerus. Mihi quidem non male retineri videntur. Quod infra c. 31. legitur : ἐν ᾧ οἱ ἀρχόντες ἀσχολίαν ἀγούσι, et Phædon. non longe ab initio : ἡ οὐκ εἰὼν οἱ ἀρχόντες παρῆναι; inde saltem, quod vult Heindorfius, non sequitur.

In *Charmide*, quem Platonis non esse mihi quidem nondum persuasit neque Astius, neque is, qui post eum lenius eandem rem tractavit, Socherus, licet opus arduum sit, refutare omnia argumenta ab utroque viro doctissimo prolata, cap. x. hæc leguntur : Καὶ γὰρ νῦν, ἔφη, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἀμάρτημα περὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι χωρὶς θατέρου, σωφροσύνης τε καὶ ὑγείας, ἰατροὶ τινες ἐπιχειροῦσιν εἶναι. In his Schleiermacherus verba σωφροσύνης τε καὶ ὑγείας esse censet insititia : θατέρου pertinere potius ad ψυχὴν et σώμα. Recte, opinor. Suspiciatus est etiam Heindorfius, illa pro glossemate habenda esse, in Corrīg. et Addend. p. 359. Quod tamen dicit, illud τε ante καὶ glossatois vix se putare, id me quidem nil moratur. Ista, quæ a Bekkero uncis certe inclusa sunt, a Platone profecta esse, hanc etiam ob causam negaverim, quod Socrates Platonicus nusquam sic sejuncturus erat σωφροσύνην et ὑγείαν, cui virtus ipsa nihil aliud quam ὑγεία ψυχῆς. Conf. Polit. iv. 18. ed. Ast., coll. Commentt. meis de Plat. Républ. p. 110. 119.

Cap. xliii. Ἐγὼ γάρ που, ἡ δ' ἔς. τοῦτ' ὁμολόγηκα, ὥς οἱ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων πράττοντες σωφρονοῦσιν ἢ τοὺς ποιοῦντας ὁμολόγησα; In hac Heindorfius scite sic commentatus est : “Ego sane, inquit ille, hoc concessi, quod temperantes sunt, qui aliena agunt. Num etiam qui faciunt, concessi? Ita Cornarius, eodemque modo Licinus. Et est hæc sane vulgatæ hujus scripturæ sententia, perversa illa quidem et argumentationi plane contraria. Nimirum concesserat Critias, σωφρονεῖν καὶ τοὺς τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ποιοῦν-

τας. Quod quum repugnare dicit Socrates ei finitioni, qua σωφροσύνην esse τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν prosuerit ipse Critias, non igitur σωφρονεῖν illos τὰ τῶν ἄλλων πράττοντας, respondebit siue dubio Critias, aliud esse τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν, aliud τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν: hoc se minus τῇ σωφροσύνῃ tribuisse, illud non item." Aliis pluribus adjectis recte dubitans de verborum integritate, hanc tandem emendationem proponit: 'Εγὼ γὰρ πῦν, ἢ δ' ὅς, οὐχ ὠμολόγηκα, ὡς οἱ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων πράττοντες σωφρονοῦσιν, εἰ τοὺς ποιοῦντας ὠμολόγηκα. Mihi sine litteræ cujusquam mutatione sic scribi posse videbatur: 'Εγὼ γὰρ ποῦ, ἢ δ' ὅς, τοῦθ' ὠμολόγηκα, ὡς οἱ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων πράττοντες σωφρονοῦσιν, ἢ τοὺς ποιοῦντας ὠμολόγησα; Ego ubinam, inquit ille, hoc concessi, quod temperantes sunt, qui aliena agunt, ubi (qua disputationis parte) vel, si mavis, quemadmodum, qui (aliena) faciunt (temperantes esse) concessi? Nusquam, inquit, se concessisse, quod temperantes sint, qui aliena agant, in ea disputationis parte, ubi, temperantes esse, qui aliena faciant, a se omnino concessum sit. Commode igitur statim Socrates: Εἰπέ μοι, ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, οὐ ταῦτόν σὺ καλεῖς τὸ ποιεῖν καὶ τὸ πράττειν; Οὐ μέντοι, ἔφη, κ. τ. λ. Aoristus ὠμολόγησα post Perfectum ὠμολόγηκα Heindorfio suspectus, potest defendi. Eodem fere modo c. 44 in his: "Α γὰρ νῦν δὲ ἐλέγομεν, ὡς μέγα ἂν εἴη ἀγαθὸν ἢ σωφροσύνη, εἰ τοιοῦτον εἴη—οὐ μοι δοκοῦμεν, ᾧ Κριτία, καλῶς ὠμολογηκέναι. Πῶς δὲ; ἢ ὅς." Οτι, ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, βραδίως ὠμολόγησαμεν, μέγα τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, κ. τ. λ.

Horatii Serm. I. Sat. 2, v. 129, 130 Carolus Fea, clarus ille Archæologus, e codd. et edd. vet. nuper edidit: *væ! pallida lecto Desiliat mulier*, etc. Lectioni *væ* obstare dicit Bentleius, quod in locis a se allatis et similibus *væ demens*, *væ misera* junctim construantur; in *væ pallida* id non possit, (ridiculum enim foret) sed *væ* solum hic et incomitatum incedat. Cui principis Criticorum Britannicorum observationi hoc opponere ausim, lectio *væ!* si cui h. l. probetur, eam non ad *pallida* solum referendam videri, sed ad verba *pallida lecto Desiliat mulier*, et ad omnia quæ sequuntur v. 130, 131: *miseram se conscia clamet, Cruribus hæc metuat, doti deprensa, egomet mi.* Ut Carm. I. 13, v. 3, 4. *væ! meum Fervens difficili bile tumet jecur.* Nam quæ Fea ad defendendam lectionem suam profert: "*Væ!* interjectio paventis, optime: *væ miseræ uxori!* clament familiares" etc., ea equidem apta huic loco esse negaverim. Male enim hæc conjunxisse videtur Vir doctissimus: *undique magno Pulsa domus strepitu resonet, væ!* quæ eum conjunxisse colligas etiam ex locis ab eo laudatis Sat. 8, 41. II. Sat. 6, 115. At magnus strepitus ille non solum clamore familiarium, sed magis etiam janua fracta et latraute cane v. 128. Quamquam.

vero lectionem *væ!* codicum quorundam auctoritate denuo commendatam, examine repetito dignam putabam, quam Heindorfius ne verbo quidem memoravit, præfero tamen lectionem vulgatam, diligentissimo huic interpreti quoque probatam, *vepallida*.

Sat. I. 4, v. 86 seq. legi scitis :

Sæpe tribus lectis videas cœnare quaternos,
E quibus *unus* amet quavis aspergere cunctos
Præter eum qui præbet aquam ; etc.

Pro lectione vulg. *unus* Fea e codd. Romanis edidit *imus*. Probabiliter. Qualis occurrit Ep. I. 18, 10 *imi Derisor lecti*, et Serm. II. 8, v. 40, 41 *imi Convivæ lecti* : ejusmodi homo, qui scurrili dicacitate symbolam daret hospiti, h. l. intelligi possit, et quidem is, qui imo lecto *imus* recumberet, ut Petronius Fea jam laudatus c. 38 ait : *Vides illum qui in imo inus recumbit?*

Sat. I. 5. v. 72 lectionem vulg. *Pæne macros arsit dum turdos versat in igni*, deseruit Fea, Codd. mss. tantum non omnibus et Acrone ac Porphyryone invitis, Lambinum secutus, edito : *Pæne arsit, macros dum turdos versat in igni* : male. Nam quod negat Editor Romanus, Synchysin in Sermonibus locum habere, id quale sit apparet. Conf. quæ de Hyperbati Sermonum Horatianorum monuit Wolfius ad Serm. I. 1, v. 88 (*"Horatius' erste Satire Lateinisch und Deutsch mit einigen Scholien"*. Berlin 1813") p. 23. Cui, ut sæpiissime, haud nominato quæ opposuit Heindorfius (ad eundem locum, p. 20), eorum magnæ parti non assentior. Haud temere vero ejusmodi Hyperbata ab Horatio adhibita putemus. Hic enim, quæ sub luce videri vellet motæ mentis notio, eam ipsa loci in verbis singulis collocandis assignati insolentia insigniorem reddidit : ut h. l. *macros*, (macri scilicet turdi in igni versati operæ pretium erant tantis turbis excitandis!) ut I. 1, 88 *nullo* (si nullo, ne minimo quidem, labore tuo retinere servareque amicos velis, natura quos tibi dat, cognatos); II. 1, 60 *scribam* (qualiscunque erit vitæ color, in proposito susceptoque scribendi consilio permanebo).

Sat. I. 9, 43 seq.

— — — — — Mæcenas quomodo tecum ?
Hinc repetit. Paucorum hominum, et mentis bene sanæ.
Nemo dexterius fortuna est usus. Haberes
Magnum adiutorem, posset qui ferre secundas,
Hunc hominem velles si tradere : dispeream, ni
Summosses omnis.

Heindorfio verba *mentis bene sanæ*, si Horatii ore prolata sumantur, mira esse videntur ; quæ sequuntur, *Nemo dexterius*

fortuna est usus, ab eodem de Mæcenate suo nebuloni isti dicta, vere contumeliosa. Hunc potius verbis *paucorum hominum et mentis bene sanæ* et interrogationi suæ *Mæcnas quomodo tecum?* causam, et conditioni, quam fert v. 46, *haberes Magnum adjutorem* etc., commendationem addere velle. Verba *Mæcnas—summosse omnis* jam Turnebum et Torrentium importuno isti tribuisse, atque etiam Bentleium sic distinxisse, non bene desertos a recentioribus. Rationibus ab Heindorfio allatis equidem non acquiescebam. Verba *Paucorum hominum, et mentis bene sanæ* multo aptius Horatio tribui etiamnum puto. Nam illa: *Paucorum hominum* hujus et ingenio et consilio multo magis conveniunt, quam fatui hominis perversitati; hæc *mentis bene sanæ* sensu vocis *cautus* vere sumta (Sat. I. 3. 61, 62. *pro bene sano Ac non incauto*) idem fere repetunt, quod Serm. I. 6, v. 50, 51 de Mæcenate suo ad Mæcenatem ipsum scripsit: *Præsertim cautum dignos adsumere prava ambitione procul* (sc. *ὄντας*). Utii vero verba *Nemo dexterius fortuna est usus* assignemus? Hæc de Mæcenate sumta, nec Poëtæ nec molestissimi hominis consilio respondere dico. De Poëtâ recte jam negavit Heindorfius. At ne importuno quidem hoc conveniunt loco, licet fortuna dexterrime usum esse tali homini est ad summam laudem pervenisse. De Mæcenatis fortuna, et quomodo ea usus esset Mæcnas, nunc minime omnium quærebatur: suam cogitans et aucupans qui repræsentatur, Horatii fortunam omnino prætereundum poterat aucupio. At num, quod Heindorfio placet, verbis, ut ab omnibus hodie leguntur: *Nemo dexterius fortuna est usus*—? Quæro: si ex inepti pravique hominis sententia Horatio nemo dexterius fortuna est usus: num *magno adjutore* tum opus erat? Quid? quo *nemo dexterius fortuna est usus* scilicet, num ei rivales adhuc submovendi? Minime: submoti fuissent omnes. Ne plura: conjecturam afferre liceat subterfugienti, ne qui forte me oblitum esse putent, quam lubrica sit conjiciendi via in scriptore tot doctissimis iisdemque acutissimis viris toties tractato et polito.

Nemo dexterius fortuna est usus. Haberes
Magnum adjutorem, posset qui ferre secundas,
Hunc hominem velles si tradere. Dispeream, ni
Submosse omnis.

Hoc si scriptum reperirem, acquiescerem. Homini importuno, fatuo, maligno hæc juncta optime, puto, convenirent. *Deterius* h. l. idem fere esset quod *minus*, ut Sat. I. 10, 90: *doliturus si placeant spe Deterius nostra*. Ep. I. 10, 19. *Deterius Libycis olet aut nilet herba lapillis?* Ita tamen, ut major vis illi vocabulo his quoque locis insit quam simplici *minus*. *Deterius*,

i. q. minus bene, medium esse quodam modo videtur inter *pejus*, Horatio etiam frequentatum, et *minus*. Nemo, inquit, fortuna sua minus usus est, quam tu, Quinte, qui per Mæcenatis familiaritatem ad summum venire potuisses: me adiutorem si haberes, quicumque obstant quin tu quam longissime procedas, statim submoveres omnes. Unum addo. Horatius quum omittere soleat illa *inquam, inquit*, ubi, uter loquatur, manifestum est, addere tale quid solet ac debet, ubi obscurum esse possit. In vulgata lectione *Nemo dexterius fortuna est usus*, an hæc de Mæcenate dicantur, an de Horatio, et quo sensu, ambigitur. Ambiguitatis culpa hæret in ipso Poëta, si sic scripsit. In conjectura nostra nihil ambigui: de Mæcenate nemo tum ne somniaret quidem.

In iis quæ statim sequuntur v. 47: *Non isto vivitur illic, Quo tu rere modo*: lectionem a Bentleio et e codd. receptam et exemplis firmatam *vivitur* non bene commutavit Fea cum altera *vivimus*. Hanc illius interpretamentum recte dicit Bentleius. Illud hoc urbanus.

Sat. II. 2, v. 14. *Cum labor expulerit fastidia*. Sic ex uno Ms. atque ex multorum codicum, qui habent *extulerit*, vestigiis vere edidisse censeo Bentleium, non motus iis, quæ Heindorfius et Fea, qui lectionem vulgatam *extuderit* tument, opposuerunt. *Extundere* enim *aliquid*, Bentleius multis exemplis probat, non esse excutere, ut ejicias et expellas, sed ut invenias et obtineas. Heindorfius quidem negat, consilium aliquid producendi aut lucrandi ("die Absicht, etwas hervorzubringen und zu gewinnen") inesse verbis Celsi IV. 4. *Aliquando, gutture et arteriis exulceratis, frequens tussis sanguinem quoque extundit*. At producendi etiamsi absit consilium, tussis tamen excutiendo producit sanguinem, ut vel hoc exemplo Bentleii observatio confirmetur. Qui quod dicit, id non solum de tali consilio intelligendum, sed etiam de tali modo; eamque explicationem patiuntur ipsa ejus verba: "*Extundere aliquid* non est excutere, ut *ejicias et expellas*, sed ut *invenias et obtineas*;" atque illa præterea, quæ sequuntur: "Id polliceri tibi ausim, ubicumque hoc vocabulum occurrit, eodem quo in his locis sensu invenienti, acquirendi, impetrandi, extorquendi venire." Apte idem laudavit Epist. II. 2, 137: *Expulit helleboro morbum bilemque meraco*. Quem e Quintiliani Instit. Orat. I. 3. (§. 6.) locum attulit Fea (*Sunt quidam, nisi institeris, remissi: quidam imperia indignantur: quosdam continet metus, quosdam debilitat: alios continuatio extundit, in aliis plus impetus facit.*) ut probaret, *extundere* nostro loco idem esse quod *retundere*, comprimere, enervare, eo parum intellecto mire abusus est Vir

clarissimus. Nam *extundere* ibi, arguta elegantia adhibitum, significat extundendo effingere. Vid. Spaldingii doctam annotationem, Vol. 1. p. 52.

CAROLUS MORGENSTERN.

Dorpati, 1821.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἁγγέλους. 1 Cor. xi. 10.

eorum numero qui de hoc loco sententias suas protulerunt G. B—m adjunctum videmus.—Ille quidem novum nobis textum effinxit, nulloque adjuvante manuscripto, legere nos docet, No. XLVII. pag. 119.

Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ θολίαν μὴ γυνὴ ἐξιοῦσα ἀνέχη ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τὴν ἄγουσαν γέλων.

Constat autem inter omnes, ubi omnium manuscriptorum est lectio concors, ibi mutationi nullum esse locum. Quam legem in sacra Scriptura indaganda jam diu stabilitam esse novimus. Locus sane difficilis nobis objicitur; sed illum more Alexandrino G. B. tractare conatur, et, quem solvere haud valet, scindere gestit nodum. Omnes quidem Codices Apostolo acceptum referunt, Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνή, κ. τ. λ. G. B. autem "legere solet," Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ θολίαν μὴ γυνή. Scripsit S. Paulus, prout iidem testantur manuscripti, ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν:—Sed mira G. B—ii in torquendo solertia eruit ἐξιοῦσα ἀνέχη.

Culpatur a quibusdam hodiernorum Criticorum nimia, timiditas (inter hos tamen vester G. B. numerari minime periclitatur): mutanda subinde sedes est, inquit, non tantum literis sed verbis etiam, imo vero et sententiis, horum in multis qui hodie extant manuscriptorum, antequam ad pristinam pervenerimus veritatem. At, mehercule, grassatur hujusmodi licentia, et labitur illico tota scriptorum auctoritas. Ut ut solutissima sit librariorum incuria, raro tamen tam longe progreditur ut flagitemus tantas cædes, tam foedas quas hodie videmus veterum lectionum *truncationes*.

Quandoque accidere potest (equidem nullus nego) ut exulare possint alia e scriptis vocabula, alia autem substituantur, utque commode inter se locum commutent vel clausulæ, vel sententiæ.—At sub habili iudice hæc omnia fieri debent.—Ego vero cognovi, haud quidem vocibus demtis, nedum sententiis: sed uno vel altero literæ nexu, vel etiam lineola mutatis, optimas in scriptis antiquis emendationes esse factas. Vindemiator prudens haud temere, strictove gladio, sed canto cultello ad vites resecandas manum ad-movet. Sed aliud est indicare pravum, aliud patefacere rectum. Interpretatur G. B. hoc modo novam suam lectionem “ Quapropter minime mulier capiti imponat velamen, risus excitaturum.”

Sed ubi videre est τοῦ ἐξιοῦσα versionem? Nusquam. Nec, mehercule, opus est: quoad enim Apostoli scopum, vox illa prorsus otiiatur. Agitur quandoquidem, non de ἐξιούσῃ muliere, sed de illa quæ in ecclesia versatur:—Nec flocci pendendum τὸ οὐ, quia τὸ “ Διὰ τοῦτο θολίαν, κ. τ. λ.” adjecto hoccine, vel demto adverbio, eundem efficit sensum. Forsan respondeatur, vocabula οὐ μὴ sensu negativo passim concurrunt:—concedimus: attamen nullibi hoc fit alio nomine, ut hic videmus θολίαν, interjecto. Quinetiam G. B., utpote Apostoli interpres, jubet; “ minime mulier capiti imponat velamen:” sed versum ad proximum adeamus visuri: πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα ἀκατακαλύπτῃ κεφαλῇ κατασχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς.—Unde in causa est vir eruditus, ut ipse sibi pugnet Apostolus, utque re vera adhortetur scēminam κατασχύνειν τὴν κεφαλὴν! hæc denique omnia efficiunt manifestam ἀνακολουθίαν, proculque dubio pes-sundabunt novam hanc quam proponit nobis G. B. lectionem; suntque monumento quanta modestia nos accingere debeamus ad Antiquorum scripta refingenda. Brevi autem recenseamus opiniones illas quæ in hac Ephemeride hoccine de loco huc usque vulgatæ sunt. No. 1. pag. 100, a B. opportune adnotatur analogia potestatis et velaminis,—atque ad Hebrææ linguæ proprietatem respicit. Docet quoque Kircherus, optimæ Concordantiæ auctor, 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 rādad significare “ actionem superioris in personam vel rem inferiore, sicut domini in servum, regis in cives, et cetera,” a quo derivatur 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 r'deed “ velamen quo mulieres caput velabant.” Apostolus, non tantum Corinthias, sed et Corinthi degentes Hebræas mulieres hac epistolæ sectione compellat. Tunc temporis enim, scēminis tum Judaicis tum Ethnicis manebat prisca consuetudo, ut capite velato sub-

jectionis symbolum exhiberent: unde fit mira Paulinæ phrasis proprietas; voluit enim ut solis mulieribus, non vero promiscue cum viris, hæc capitis obductio usurparetur. Namque prisco tempore viris tum Hebræorum tum Ethnicorum mos erat velato capite precari Deum. Pro certo quoque habetur ipsos Judæorum¹ pontifices tiaram quandam capite gestasse dum in templo rem divinam faciebant. Etiam hodie videre licet libro in quodam, cui titulus est, si non fallat memoria, "*Gemme antique figurate colle sposizioni* de P. Maffei per Rossi, Romæ 1707 et 9." imagines plurimas quæ ipsos depingunt sacerdotes obducto capite adstantes ad aras, huncque morem his verbis reprehendit Apostolus: *πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν.* No. IV. 800. Φίλος pro "*τοὺς ἀγγέλους,*" at nullo favente manuscripto, nec depulsa loci obscuritate, ἀλλήλους substituere vellet; quoad cetera vulgatam complectitur versionem. No. VIII. 273. prout opinatur B. qui prioribus, sequente Harwoodio, suffragatur, vertere debemus *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους* "*propter exploratores.*" Idem videtur Barkerō, No. XI. I. qui narrat quoque (No. XL. 322.) Antonii Borremansii dialogum (Amst. 1678) sequenti faventem interpretationi: nempe, "*Ideo debet mulier potestatem habere supra caput propter angelos.*" Hac pendente disceptatione meam quoque proposui humillime sententiam, (No. I. 252.) quæ vulgata nititur. Ab hac prolata opinione jam undecim anni effluerunt. Sed nihil muto, nisi quod ad periphrasin attinet per quam, quum interpretari vellem *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, Anglice dedi "*in reverence to the angels.*" Nunc vero eadem mihi cum Φίλω opinio (No. IV. 800.) scilicet vulgatam interpretationem, si per angelos, cælo degentes, vel nuncii cœlestes intelligendi sunt, dogma nescio quid nocivum vel quandam Idololatriæ speciem præ se ferre—quo nihil magis alienum ab Apostoli mente fingi potest. Qua de causa Angelorum in cultu mulieres debent se præbere conspectas? Hoc namque in Epistola ad Colos. ii. 18. clare interdictum invenimus—*Μηδὲς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύεται, θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων.* Malo, post *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, subintelligere *τῆς ἐκκλησίας*² nam,

¹ Vide Exodum xxviii. 4. et factam mentionem de vestibis summo pontifici propriis, inter quas notatur *הַמִּצְנֶפֶת* miznefet^h, tiara quam inter sacra sacerdos gestabat.

² De Angelis Ecclesiæ, vide in Johannis Apocalypsi passim. Ministri, Doctores, vel Nuncii Ecclesiæ intelliguntur.

teste Apostolo passim in Epistolis ad Corinthios, ad Timotheum, ad Titum, atque alios, ἡ ἐκκλησία, et multo magis οἱ ἄγγελοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, insignem in mores foemineos censuram exercebant.

Nitamur denique, quantum fieri possit, ut hujus loci tenebris scintillulam saltem luminis injiciamus.

Hunc morem decorum Corinthiis imbuere multis modis aggreditur Apostolus. Primum adhibetur argumentum a distinctione quadam Divinarum Personarum, quæ quum dignitate sint quodam modo diversæ, his personis tamen comparantur et viri ordo excelsior, et foeminæ submissa, sed nihilo minus proxima conditio. Ex. gratia: θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶ· κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ· κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ ὁ Θεός. Deinde, ad hoc decus magis diligendum, hortatur Corinthios ut ipsam Naturam ducem adhibeant: ἢ οὐδὲ αὐτὴ ἡ φύσις διδάσκει ὑμᾶς ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ μὲν ἐν κομᾷ ἀτίμω αὐτῷ ἐστὶ; Postea, ut officia hæc recusantibus nullum sit refugium, eos rapit ad innatam sibi ipsis conscientiam, Ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς κρίνετε, πρέπον ἐστὶ γυναῖκα ἀκατακάλυπτον τῷ Θεῷ προσεύχεσθαι; Postremo, securi reponamus, reddamusque directum manuscriptis honorem—Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἄγγέλους (subintelligo) τῆς ἐκκλησίας: Propterea debet mulier potestatem habere (vel, exhibere) supra caput propter Angelos (Ecclesiæ). En quam proxime hæc versio ad vulgatam accedat! Tota vero clausula sensu quidem notabili et ancipiti, at de industria scripta fuisse videtur. Constat enim τὸ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ubique significare, habere potestatem: adjectis tamen vocabulis ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς, primi commatis frangitur vis, nihilque aliud exprimit periodus, quam habere vel exhibere potestatem quæ supra se ipsam est, vel subjectum se præbere. Quoniam autem τῷ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν, &c., imperium vel auctoritas, τῷ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς subjectio significatur; hoc nimirum fecit Apostolus ad docendum, tempus tum demum advenisse quo foeminæ major esset impertienda dignitas; attamen esse perquam necessarium ut hæc libertas cum submissa modestia conjuncta esset; atque hic sensus quam clarissime oritur, si post ἐξουσίαν subintelligatur ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, emphasi posita in τῷ ἐπὶ. Adde quod hæc præpositio cum genitivo conjuncta melius exprimit τὴν τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ιδέαν.—Adeo non prava lectio in τῷ ἐξουσίαν extat, ut vox aptior vel plenior eligi non potuisset ad veros variosque Apostoli mentis affectus exprimendos. Haud enim dicitur ἡ γυνὴ δύναμιν, sed

ἐξουσίαν ἔχει: τῷ “δύναμις,” propria alicui potestas significatur, scilicet ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἐξουσία autem, si etymologice deducatur, inveniēmus οὐσία “essentia,” et ἐξ, nempe ἐξ ἑτέρου, *ab alio quodam*. Vocabulo ἐξουσία, igitur, *ad superius aliquid relatio* subintelligitur; τὸ ἔχειν quoque, nisi nobis amissa sit verior lectio παρέχειν, nihilominus pro ipsa sæpissime usurpatur; et, Lexicis data fide, significat *cingere, circumdare*: ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, *debet ergo mulier relationem ad aliquid superius exhibere supra caput*. Hæccine explicatio versibus cum præcedentibus optime concordat. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικὸς, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ ἐξ ἀνδρὸς, καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα. Ilaud dubium, recte conjicit Barkerus, No. XI. 3. scilicet *acum discriminalem*, aut *hastæ figuram*, quam fœminæ supra caput exhibebant, antiquum designasse Subjectionis symbolum; his autem verbis ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν minime opinor ad eadem respexisse Apostolum; excerpta quidem quæ vir doctus nobis impertitur, apud Romanas in usu fuisse hoc ornamentum, indicant: sed satius esset si demonstrasset apud Corinthias hunc morem extitisse; agique quæstionem de nuptis mulieribus tantum; (innuptæ vero, duce ipso Barkero, acum hanc non gestabant). At fœminis universis in Ecclesiam introitus erat; et, nullo discrimine, πόσαις ταῖς προσευχομέναις, ἢ προφητευσούσαις, vel nuptis, vel innuptis, dirigit Apostolus orationem. Quinetiam S. Pauli hortatio non est de more quovis ornandi crines, at simpliciter περὶ τοῦ καλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Ex his colligere possumus, mulierem quacunque conditione, quamvis acu discriminali vel quovis alio modo crines ornatam, si quando absque velamine cœtibus in publicis orabat vel prophetabatur, peccasse in Apostoli mandatum.—Audiamus vers. 6. Εἰ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνὴ καὶ κειράσθω: inde τὸ κομᾶν, alere crines, ἀνευ τοῦ κατακαλύπτεσθαι æque valebat ac τὸ κείρασθαι:—acum autem discriminalem gestare nihil aliud erat quam certo modo alere vel ornare crines, fiebatque *capite aperto*, hac ergo consuetudine peccabatur in mandatum. Atqui tandem liquidissime apparet quam longissime abfuisse ab animo S. Pauli, quando scribebat ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, ut commendaret vel etiam designaret morem decies a se postulatis adversantem. Cunctas a contrario fœminas clare jubet operire caput in Ecclesia versantes, quod omnes homines a Christo nato intellexerunt; ubicunque enim orbis terrarum floret Christianismus, hæc consuetudo

jam diu viget et vigebit. Ex hisque omnibus perpensis mihi sedet sententia de *non mutandis Manuscriptis*:—Quoad autem B—ii conjecturam, διὰ τοῦτο οὐ βολίαν, κ. τ. λ., hanc quidem existimo viri hujus ingenio erudito indignissimam.

W.

Dabam Liverpoolii D. 3. Aprilis, 1822.

OBSERVATIONS

On that part of a work entitled, EMPEDOCLIS ET PARMENIDIS FRAGMENTA EX CODICE TAURINENSIS BIBLIOTHECÆ RESTITUTA ET ILLUSTRATA, AB AMEDEO PEYRON, LIPSIAE, 1810, in which the author treats of the genuine Greek text of the Commentary of Simplicius in Aristotelem De Cælo et Mundo.

THE intention of the learned Professor Peyron in this part of his work, is to demonstrate that the Greek text of the Venice edition of this commentary of Simplicius is a translation by some modern Greek sophist from a barbarous Latin version of this work made by Guillelmus de Moërbeka, in the 13th century. And the Professor thinks that he has most satisfactorily proved this to be the case, from this version of Moërbeka so exactly corresponding with the Greek of the Venice edition, which is faulty in the extreme, as he shows in many instances by comparing it with the Codex Taurinensis of this work, in which alone the genuine text of Simplicius is to be found.

Plausible however as the Professor's arguments in support of this opinion may appear to be, I trust that the following instances of variations between the version of Moërbeka, and the Greek of the Venice edition, will be found to be at least equally powerful in proving that the latter is not a translation of the former.

But previous to the detail of these instances, it is necessary to observe, in the first place, that I am in possession of the first edition of this version of Moërbeka, which was published at Venice in the year 1540, of which the Professor says, (p. 8.) "At quum hanc habere hucusque non licuerit, utor alia editione anni 1563. ibidem fol." He adds, "Hæc etsi dicatur in fronte novi-

ter fere de integro interpretata, ac cum fidissimis codicibus Græcis recens collata, tamen quam parum promissis editor steterit, vel ex eo licet agnoscere, quod postremi duo libri eduntur ex *Guilielmo Morbeto Do Interprete*. Priores duos, licet nusquam appareat nomen interpretis, a versione Moërbeka penitus fuisse desumptos, tum ex barbarica scriptura, tum ex pari interpretandi modo, plane judico." And he concludes with observing, that he shall cite this edition of 1563 as the true version of Moërbeka. In the second place, it is remarkable that this version, which the Professor confidently ascribes to Moërbeka, should in the first edition of it be said to have been wholly made by *Guillermus Morbetus*; for the following is the title of this translation: *Simplicii Philosophi Acutissimi Commentaria in Quatuor Libros De Celo Aristotelis. Guillermo Morbete Interprete. Quæ omnia, cum fidissimis Codicibus Græcis recens collata fuere. Venetiis 1540*. Whether therefore this Morbetus is in reality the same with Moërbeka, who was the Archbishop of Corinth in the 13th century, and whose version of the treatise of Proclus *De Providentia* ¹ is extant in the 8th volume of the *Bibliotheca* of Fabricius, I shall leave to others to determine, who are better qualified than I am for such philosophical discussions. I shall only remark, that to me it appears that the version of Proclus *De Providentia*, which is ascribed to Moërbeka, is far more barbarous than that of *Simplicius De Cælo*, which is ascribed to Morbetus; and this opinion of mine might be corroborated by many instances, if it were necessary. It is however sufficient for my purpose that this edition of 1540 is that of which the edition of 1563 is a reprint.

Having premised thus much, I proceed to the detail of instances, which sufficiently, as I conceive, confute the opinion of Professor Peyron, that the Venice Greek edition of *Simplicius De Cælo* is a translation of the Latin version of that work by Moërbeka, or Morbetus.

In the first place, in p. i. of the Preface,² we have in the Latin, "Sed si velit aliquis Aristotelis theoriam de mundo videre, in omnibus simul ipsius negotiis naturalibus, *primum de mundo*

¹ At the end of my translation of Proclus on the Theology of Plato, in 2 vols. 4to, I have given a translation of this treatise of Proclus, accompanied by numerous emendations of the text.

² All the following citations are made from the above-mentioned Latin version of Morbetus, and the notes in the margin of it, which were made by me from comparing it with the printed Greek edition of this work, when I was engaged in translating all the works of Aristotle.

tractasse dicendum." But in this passage, the Greek word for *primum* is wanting in the original. A little after, in the passage, "Ad alios autem expositores dicendum, quod non videtur sermo de quatuor elementis in his *præter necessarium*, neque simpliciter præter theoriam de celestibus assumptus esse, sed principaliter de ipsis docet," the Greek for the words *præter necessarium*, i. e. *παρα το αναγκαιον*, is wanting in the Venice edition. In p. 3 a, "motus quidem enim *animalium* (ut æstimo) neque unus proprie est, cum fiat secundum extensionem et inflexionem membrorum." But the Greek, instead of *ζωνων* for *animalium*, has erroneously *σωμάτων*.

Again, in p. 7 a, "et quidem et totum a sui *unionem* in seipso producit propriam discretionem." The whole, or the universe, from the union of itself, produces in itself a proper distinction and separation [of its parts.] But the Greek for *unionem* has erroneously *ονοματος*, instead of *ενότητος*, which the interpreter found in his Ms. In p. 8 b, Comment. 15. Simplicius having observed, that Aristotle in what he there says departs much from nature, contrary to his usual custom, *οτι επι πολυ παρα το εθος αποβαινει της φυσικως*, adds, according to the Latin interpreter, "hæc enim sunt *mutabilia*:" but the Greek has rightly *θauμαστα γαρ ταυτα*. P. 106. Comment. 20. "appetitus enim et totius et partium est ad medium, et apud illud salvari volunt et contineri, *vagam* in sui ipsorum natura consistentiam habentia." In this passage the Greek for the word *vagam* is wanting in the Venice edition. P. 146. "Sed quoniam duorum horum sermo totus dictus est, uno quidem, si debeat aliquid generari et corrumpi, oportet esse omnino subjectum aliquod et contrarium ex quo fit et in quod corrumpitur, altero autem quod *circulari* motui non est motus contrarius." Here the Greek word which should correspond to *circulari*, is in the Venice edition erroneously *φυσει*, instead of *κυκλικω*; I say *erroneously*, for it is a well-known position of Aristotle, that to a circular motion no other motion is contrary. And shortly after in the same page, Simplicius shows that Aristotle and Plato are not discordant with each other, when the former asserts that the world is *unbegotten*, and the latter that it is *generated*; because according to Plato, though the world perpetually proceeds from its cause, yet as every thing which derives its existence from a certain cause is generated, the universe also, in consequence of not being self-subsistent, is generated. Hence he observes, "genitum autem communiter dicitur quod sui ipsius subsistentiam ab aliqua causa accipit; etenim quod fit, ab aliquo faciente fit, et quod generatur ab aliquo geuerante generatur, et impossibile, ut ait Plato, sine

causa generationem habere ; et palam, quod secundum hoc *ingenitum* est quod primum omnium causa, quod et unum et simplicissimum est, siquidem omnia participant uno, et quod non participat uno, nihil est : quod autem unum nihil participat multitudine : quare genitum omnem multitudinatum est." In this passage, in the original, instead of *αγεννητον*, *ingenitum*, which Morbetus evidently read in his Ms., and which is the true reading, we find by a strange blunder *καχωρισμενον*, in the printed Greek. P. 156, in the first line of the page, "corrumpitur enim *aqua* ab igne in ignem." * But the Greek, instead of *υδαρ*, *aqua*, has erroneously *τινα*. Thus too in the same page, at the beginning of the second column, "et quamvis habeat aliquid *animale* nutritiva virtus, tamen secundum naturales transmutationes ita perficitur." But the Greek, instead of *ψυχικον*, *animale*, has erroneously *φυσικον*.

In p. 17 a, Comment. 23, in which Simplicius is speaking of augmentation, we have in the Greek *το γαρ αυτα προστιθεμενον, και εναντιον και ομοιον εστι αυτω ω προστιθεται*, i. e. "That which is added to a thing, is both contrary and similar to that to which it is added." But the Latin has, "quod enim ipsi quod apponitur est contrarium, etsimili eis scilicet cui apponitur contrarium est." This however is erroneous, and not what Simplicius meant in this place to say. For he had just before observed, that augmentation is a certain generation, and that a thing which is increased, is increased from something which is contrary to it. The Greek therefore is right, and the Latin is evidently not that from which it was translated. P. 176. "Deinde dicendum (ut estimo) quod Arist. non omnem alterationem abnegat a celestibus : *non enim utique et imperfectivam invicem tarditatem et transumptionem*." But the Greek of the latter part of this sentence is, *ουδε γαρ την τελειωτικην προς αλληλα μεταδοσιν και μεταληψιν*, which is correct ; but the Latin is erroneous in the extreme. For the intention of Simplicius in this part of his Commentary, is to show that Aristotle does not deny all change of quality (*αλλοιωσιν*, in Morbetus *alterationem*) in the heavenly bodies ; since he does not deny of them a mutual communication and reception [of light and power] of a perfective nature. In p. 18 a, Comment. 26. Simplicius says, conformably to Aristotle, that it is impossible an immortal nature [i. e. the heaven] should not be co-adapted to an immortal being [i. e. to deity.] And that as this is asserted by all men, not only by the Greeks, but also by the barbarians, it shows that such an opinion is natural to the souls of men, *εν ταις ψυχαις των ανθρωπων* ;—so the Greek, but the

Latin of Morbetus has, *in animalibus*. P. 18 a, Comment. 27. "Si enim *mundani* Dii, quod quidem tanquam probatum et evidens dimisit, est aliquod divinum corpus *exemptum* ab ipsis." But in the Greek *εγκοσμιοι*, *mundani*, is wanting; and for *εξηρημενον*, *exemptum*, it is necessary to read *εξηρητημενον*. In the same page also, and shortly after, we find in the Latin, "Audivi autem ego *Ægyptios* quidem astrorum observatione, habuisse descriptas non paucioribus quam a quinque millibus annorum, *Babilonios* autem adhuc a pluribus." But the Greek, instead of five thousand years, which is doubtless what Simplicius wrote, has *ουκ ελαττοσιν η δισχιλιοις ενιαυτοις*, for not less than two thousand years. Again, in the same page, the following passage, Comment. 25, which I had overlooked, is defective, but the deficiency is supplied in the Greek. The passage is, "mihi enim non frustra videtur ultimo apposuisse, [impossible,] sed tanquam omnibus his secundum passiones accidentibus." But the Greek rightly adds, *αμοιρον δειξη τον ουρανον*, which Morbetus has not translated. And a few lines after the Latin has, "hoc enim tanquam suppositiones accipiens ex ipsis contraria conclusit." But the Greek which should correspond to *contraria conclusit*, is so far from this correspondence, that it is *τον ουρανον αγενητον συνεπερανε*.

Again, in p. 23 b, near the bottom, Comment. 36, Simplicius, speaking of the motion of the planets, and the motion of the sphere of the fixed stars, and showing, conformably to Aristotle, that the one is not contrary to the other, is made to say rightly in the Latin, "deinde utraque harum secundum idem tempus *ab oriente et ab occasu* dicitur utique moveri;" but in the Greek, instead of what should correspond to the words *ab oriente et ab occasu*, we have *απ' ανατολων επ' ανατολας*. P. 30 b, Comment. 37, "principaliter quidem de simplicibus elementis proponit inquirere, et ostendit quod *finita* et secundum numerum, et secundum magnitudinem." So the Latin rightly, but the Greek, which should correspond to *quod finita*, is, instead of doing so, *οτι απειρον*. Thus also in p. 31 b, Comment. 42. "Ostensum est in naturali auditu, quod assequitur tempus quidem motui, motus autem magnitudini ejus quod movetur, et ejus super quod motus, et quod si tempus fuerit finitum, necesse et motum esse *finitum*, et magnitudinem amborum, scilicet ejus quod movetur, et ejus super quod motus." In this passage, the Latin in the words "*necesse et motum esse finitum*," has rightly *finitum*, as must be obvious to every one; but the Greek has most erroneously *απειρον*. In p. 33 a, Comment.

49, in the words, "principalis intentio in hoc *capitulo* est de simplicibus in mundo corporibus ostendere, &c.," the Latin has rightly *capitulo*, but the Greek, instead of κεφάλαιον, has κεντρον.

Farther still, in p. 34 a, Comment. 56, Simplicius says, it is demonstrated in the Physics of Aristotle, "quod nullum finitum finitam distantiam in infinito tempore pertransit." And this is rightly asserted, and is undoubtedly what Simplicius intended to say; but the Greek has most erroneously, οτι ουδεν πεπερασμενον εν πεπερασμενω χρονω διεσθιν. In p. 35 a, Comment. 60, Simplicius, in elucidating the demonstration of Aristotle, that there is not an infinite body, observes that Aristotle physically infers this "ex eo quod elementa numero et magnitudine sunt finita. Neque enim omnia infinita possibile est esse, non enim utique multa infinita, &c." Here the Latin has rightly *infinita*, in the words *Neque enim omnia infinita, &c.*, but the Greek most erroneously πεπερασμενα. In p. 37 a, Comment. 71, Simplicius rightly referring to the Physics of Aristotle, says that in the 8th book of that work, Aristotle demonstrates that no finite magnitude possesses an infinite power, "nullam autem finitam magnitudinem virtutem habere infinitam, quod quidem in octavo ejusdem negotii demonstravit." But the Greek, instead of εν τω ογδοω, has εν τω εννατω, though the Physics do not consist of more than eight books. In p. 45 b, Comment. 97, Simplicius observes, that Aristotle is there speaking of the intellectual and immoveable principles which are the causes of the motions of the celestial spheres; "de intellectualibus et immobilibus principiis videtur dicere de moventibus cœlestes sphæras.—Nam cœlum movet immobilis causa existens melior ipso." But the Greek, instead of περι των νοερων, *de intellectualibus*, has most erroneously περι των ουρανιων. In p. 46 a, Comment. 97, we find in the Latin, "Continuus autem circularis motus ostensus est in octavo de naturali auditu." And, this is correct; for Aristotle does demonstrate in his Physics, that a circular is a *continual* motion. But the Greek, instead of συνεχης, *continuus*, has κοινοτερον. And in the next line, the Latin has rightly, "Sed et quia circulariter movetur cœlum ad intellectum conversum." In the Greek, however, we have ουρανον, *heaven*, instead of νουν, *intellect*. In one part of the following passage in p. 47 b, Comment. 102, both the Latin and Greek are discordant with each other, and both are erroneous. The passage is this, "puta quod trigonum ex tribus rectis secundum angulum compositis, tribus autem ex trigonis sex secundum angulos et lineas, sed non secundum plana compositis."

Simplicius is here speaking of the analysis of things composite into such as are simple, after the manner of mathematicians. Hence the Latin should be, *cubum autem ex tetragonis sex*; instead of "*tribus autem ex trigonis sex*;" and the Greek, which is *ἐκ τριῶν δὲ τριγῶνων ἐξ*, should be *τὸν κύβον δὲ ἐκ τετραγώνων ἐξ*. For the terminating sides of a cube are six squares. That this reading is correct, is evident from what Simplicius shortly after says, i. e. "Nam mathematicus quidem—resolvit trigonum in tres rectas et cubum in sex tetragona."

Many other instances of great difference between the Latin and Greek might be adduced; but as I persuade myself that the learned and intelligent reader will be sufficiently convinced from those already given, that the Greek of Simplicius is not a translation from the Latin of Moërbeka or Morbetus, I shall conclude this article with corrections of certain passages which are faulty, both in the Latin and Greek, but which, though erroneous, accord with each other.

In p. 30 b, Comment. 37, Simplicius observes, that Aristotle having shown that no simple body is infinite in magnitude, and it being evident that simple bodies are finite in number, concludes that the whole, which is composed of them, viz. the universe, is finite. He then adds, "*Primo autem ostendit, quod necessaria est naturalis ratio discernens, sive est aliquid corpus infinitum sive non; siquidem hæc differentia causa fere totius contradictionis inter naturales est, quæ apud physiologos. Propter hanc enim hi quidem unum mundum, et finitum dicebant, quicumque non acceptabant infinitum in principio, ut Aristoteles et Plato; hi autem unum infinitum, ut Anaximenes aërem infinitum principium esse dicens; hi autem et multitudine infinitos mundos, ut Anaximandrus quidem infinitum magnitudine principium ponens, infinitum sic et mundum dicebat.*" In this passage, for *multitudine* in the words "*hi autem et multitudine infinitos mundos,*" it is necessary to read *magnitudine*: for it was the dogma of Democritus, as Simplicius shortly after observes, that there are worlds infinite in multitude. But the Greek has also erroneously in this part of the above passage, *τῷ πληθεῖ*, instead of *τῷ μεγεθεῖ*. In p. 46 a, Comment. 99, in the words, "*et hæc scripsit, mundum hunc neque aliquis deorum, neque aliquis hominum fecit, sed erat semper,*" the name of *Heraclitus* is wanting immediately after scripsit, and it is also wanting in the Greek. For from what is afterwards added by Simplicius, it is evident that the above words are to be ascribed to Heraclitus. But he adds as follows: "*Verumtamen Alexander volens Heraclytum dicere mundum genitum et corrupti-*

bilem, de intelligibili mundo sic ipsum dixisse ait." Alexander, who considered Heraclitus as one who asserted that the world is generable and corruptible, says, that in the above citation he speaks of the intelligible world. This remarkable passage of Heraclitus is in the Greek τον κοσμον τουτον, ουτε τις θεων, ουτε τις ανθρωπων εποισεν, αλλ' ηθ' αει. In p. 58. b, Lib. 2, Comment. 3, Simplicius, explaining what Aristotle says about the fable of Atlas supporting the heavens, and which is alluded to by Homer when he says of Atlas in the Odyssey,

And the long pillars which on earth he rears

End in the starry vault, and prop the spheres,

observes as follows: "Si autem fabula est divinum aliquid occultans in seipsa et sapiens, dicatur quod Atlas unus quidem est et eorum Tartareorum qui circa Bacchum sunt, qui eo quod non attendebat ipsi perfecte, hoc est non secundum solum Tartaream congregationem operabatur circa Bacchi operationem, sed declinabat aliquid et ad Jovialem continentiam, secundum ambos proprietatis operatur circa maximas mundi partes, discernens quidem et sursum tenens cœlum a terra, ut non confundantur superiora cum inferioribus. — cum etiam columnæ simul utramque habeant virtutem, discretivamque simul et continuativam eorum quæ supra posita sunt cum inferius positis." In this passage for congregationem it is necessary to read separationem, and in the Greek for συγχρησιν which corresponds to congregationem, we must substitute διαχρησιν. This emendation is evidently requisite from what Simplicius adds in the latter part of this extract, viz. "that pillars possess both these powers, a power of separating, and a power of connecting things placed above with those placed below." In p. 82 a, Comment. 47, Simplicius observes that the Pythagoreans supposing the decad to be a perfect number, were willing to collect the number of the bodies moved in a circle, into the decadic number. He adds, "hence they say, that the inerratic sphere, the seven planets, this our earth, and the antichthon, complete the decad; and in this manner Aristotle understands the assertions of the Pythagoreans." He then observes: "Qui autem sincerius ista callent (γνησιωστερον αυτων μετασχοντες) ignem quidem in medio dicunt conditivam virtutem (δημιουργικην δυναμιν) ex medio totam terram alentem, et quod infrigidatum ipsius est recreantem (αναγειρουσαν). Propter quod hi quidem Zenus turrem (Ζηνος πυργον) ipsum vocant, ut ipse in Pythagoricis narravit. Alii autem Jovis custodiam (Διος φυλακην) ut in his. Alii autem Jovis thronum (Διος θρονον) ut alii aiunt. Antrum (αντρον) autem

terram dicebant, tanquam organum et ipsum temporis. Dierum enim hæc et noctuum causa est. Diem enim facit versus solem pars illuminata. Noctem autem versus contrarium umbræ factæ ab ipsa. Antichthonam autem lunam vocabant Pythagorici, sicut et ætheriam terram, et tanquam obumbriantem solare lumen quod est proprium terræ, et tanquam terminantem cœlestia sicut terra id quod sub luna est." In that part of this remarkable passage in which it is said both in the Latin and the Greek, that the Pythagoreans called the earth *a cavern*, it is necessary for *αντρον* to read *αστρον*, *a star*. For a little before, both Aristotle and Simplicius inform us that the Pythagoreans asserted that *the earth exists as one of the stars*. And this is confirmed by their calling the earth one of *the instruments of time*: for the stars are thus denominated by Plato in the *Timæus*. Meursius in his *Denarius Pythagoricus*, p. 19. thinks we should read *κεντρον* for *αντρον*; but he was evidently mistaken.

From this account given by Simplicius, it appears that the above mentioned decad of the Pythagoreans consists of, the inerratic sphere, the seven planets, the earth, and the fire in the centre of the earth. It is also evident from this passage, as I have elsewhere observed, that the moderns are mistaken in supposing, that by the fire in the middle, the Pythagoreans meant the sun. And in p. 87 a, Comment. 60, Simplicius observes: "Cum autem ostendisset ambo problemata, et quod in medio est terra, et quod immobilis, neque circulariter circa medium, neque super rectam mota, communem adjecit conclusionem dicens esse manifestum ex dictis, quod neque movetur, neque extra medium *movetur*." In the last word of this passage for *movetur*, it is obviously necessary to read *ponitur*, and in the Greek for *κινείται*, to substitute *κειται*.

I shall conclude these observations, with noticing an error into which the learned Professor has fallen, through not understanding what Simplicius says of Empedocles and Eudemus the celebrated disciple of Aristotle. The error I allude to is in p. 52, where the Professor cites the following passage of Simplicius, in his commentary on the Physics. *Τουτο δ' εοικεν Εμπεδοκλῆς ἢ εἰπειν, ὅτι τὸ κρατεῖν καὶ κινεῖν ἐν μέρει τὴν φιλίαν καὶ τὸ νεῖκος ἐξ ἀναγκῆς υπαρχεῖ τοῖς πραγμασίν· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ τὸ ηρεμεῖν ἐν τῇ μεταξύ χρόνων τῶν γὰρ ἐναντιῶν κινήσεων ἡρεμία ἐν τῇ μεταξύ ἐστίν. Εὐδήμος οὖν τὴν ἀκινήσιαν ἐν τῇ τῆς φιλίας ἐπικρατείᾳ κατὰ τὴν σφαῖραν ἐκδέχεται, ἐπειδὴν ἀπαντὰ συγκρίθῃ*
ἐνθ' οὗτ' ἡελιοιο διεῖται ὡκεία γῆ.

ἀλλ' ὡς φησιν,

οὕτως ἀρμονίης πυκίνῃ κρυφῶ ἐστηρικται,
σφαίρος κυκλοτερὴς μόνῃ περιγυθεῖ αἰών.¹

And after these other verses follow. The Professor then remarks, "Quis credat totidem esse Eudemi versus? Etsi ejus φυσικα, liber περι γωνίας, et Historia Geometrica et Astrologica exciderint, fragmenta tamen a Simplicio servata argumento sunt, illum neque metro sua scita commendasse, neque eum esse cui Amicitia, Discordia, Sphærus saperent. Quapropter nullus vereor emendare, ut sit Ἐμπεδοκλῆς οὐκ τὴν ἀκίνητιαν πρὸ τοῦ quod est Εὐδημος οὖν, facillima nominum permutatione, si Ἐμπεδοκλῆς compendiose scribatur." The Professor's mistake originated from not perceiving that in the words ἀλλ' ὡς φησιν, Ἐμπεδοκλῆς is understood; for the verses that follow these words were evidently written by that philosopher. The meaning of Simplicius therefore is, that Eudemus admits immobility in the domination of friendship in the sphere of Empedocles.

T.

AN INQUIRY

*into the Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and
Mythology.*

BY R. P. KNIGHT.

PART VIII.—[Continued from No. 51. p. 51.]

184. AFTER the conquests of Alexander had opened a communication with India, Minerva was frequently represented with the elephant's skin upon her head instead of the helmet;² the elephant having been, from time immemorial, the symbol of divine wisdom among the Gentoos; whose god Gonnis or Pollear is represented by a figure of this animal half humanised; which the Macha Alla, or god of destruction of the Tartars, is

¹ For αἰών here, the Professor very properly substitutes γαῖων. Thus too, Parmenides, speaking of the one being, says,

παντοθεν ἐκυκλου σφαίρης ἐναλιγμων οὐρανῷ
μῆσσιν ἰσοπαλῆς, καὶ μὴ μὴ περιγυθῆι χείρων.

² See coins of Alexander II. king of Epirus, and some of the Ptolemies.

260 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

usually seen trampling upon.¹ On some of the coins of the Seleucida, the elephant is represented with the horns of the bull; sometimes drawing the chariot of Minerva,² in her character of Bellona; and at others bearing a torch, the emblem of the universal agent fire, in his proboscis, and the cornucopiæ, the result of its exertion under the direction of divine wisdom, in his tail.³

185. The ram has been already noticed as the symbol of Mercury; but at Sais in Egypt, it seems to have represented some attribute of Minerva;⁴ upon a small bust of whom, belonging to Mr. Payne Knight, it supplies the ornament for the visor of the helmet, as the sphinx does that of the crest; the whole composition showing the passive and active powers of generation and destruction, as attributes to Divine Wisdom. In another small bronze of very ancient workmanship, which has been the handle of a vase, rams are placed at the feet, and lions at the head, of an androgynous figure of Bacchus, which still more distinctly shows their meaning; and in the ancient metropolitan temple of the North, at Upsal in Sweden, the great Scandinavian goddess Isa was represented riding upon a ram, with an owl in her hand.⁵ Among the Egyptians, however, Ammon was the deity most commonly represented under this symbol; which was usually half humanised, as it appears in pl. i. vol. i. of the Select Specimens; in which form he was worshipped in the celebrated oracular temple in Libya, as well as that of Thebes;⁶ and was the father of that Bacchus who is equally represented with the ram's horns, but young and beardless.

186. Ammon, according to some accounts, corresponded with the Jupiter;⁷ and according to others, with the Pan⁸ of the Greeks; and probably he was something between both, like the Lycæan Pan, the most ancient and revered deity of the

¹ See those of Seleucus I. Antiochus VI. &c.

² Τοῦτου τοῦ νομοῦ μίμητις πόλις Σαῖς ——— της πόλεως θεὸς ἀρχηγὸς ἐστίν, Ἀγυπτίῃ μιν τουνήμι Νηῖθ, Ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ, ὡς ἐκείνων λόγος, Ἀθῆνα. Platon. Timæ. p. 174. Scut. 1043. Fic.

ἱμάσι λαιταὶ πρόβατον καὶ θηβαῖται. Strabon. lib. xvii. p. 559.

³ Ol. Rudbeck. Atlant. vol. ii. p. 209. fig. 13.

⁴ Ἀπο τούτου κρ. ροστυον τωγαλμα του Διου ποιευσι Αἰγυπτιοι· απο δε Αἰγυπτίων Αἰμολοι, εο. τις Αἰγυπτ. αἰ τε καὶ Α. θ. ὧπων αἰτοχοι, καὶ Φωνη μεταξυ αμφοτέρων νομιζοιτες. Herodot. lib. ii. c. 42.

⁵ Ἀμμιουν γινε Αἰγυπτιοι κίλουσι τον Διαι. Lib. ii. s. 42. Herodot.

⁶ Τον πρωτον θιον (Αμμιουν) τῷ παντι τον αυτον νομιζουσι. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 374.

Arcadians, the most ancient people of Greece.¹ His title was employed by the Ægyptians as a common form of appellation towards each other, as well as of solemn invocation to the Deity, in the same manner as we employ the title of Lord, and the French that of Seigneur; and it appears to have been occasionally compounded with other words, and applied to other deities.² According to Jablonski, who explains it from the modern Coptic, it signified precisely the same as the epithet Lycæan, that is lucid, or productive of light.³ It may therefore have been applied with equal propriety to either Jupiter or Pan; the one being the luminous ætherial spirit considered abstractedly, and the other, as diffused through the mass of universal matter. Hence Pan is called, in the Orphic Hymns, Jupiter the mover of all things, and described as harmonising them by the music of his pipe.⁴ He is also called the pervader of the sky⁵ and of the sea,⁶ to signify the principle of order diffused through heaven and earth; and the Arcadians called him the Lord of matter,⁷ which title is expressed in the Latin name Sylvanus; SYLVA, ΤΑΦΑ, and ΤΑΗ, being the same word written according to the different modes of pronouncing of different dialects. In a choral ode of Sophocles, he is addressed by the title of Author and di-

¹ Ante Jovem genitum terras habuisse feruntur
Arcades, et Luna gens prior illa fuit.

Ovid. Fast. lib. ii. v. 289.

They were of the Pelasgian race, and being in possession of a poor and mountainous country, they kept it, whilst the more fertile parts of Greece were continually changing inhabitants. Thucyd. lib. i.; Herodot. lib. i. s. 146.; Pausan. lib. viii. s. 1. Their being anterior to Jupiter and the Moon, means no more than that they were anterior to the established religion, by which the divine personifications were ascertained, and made distinct objects of worship.

² Σπεινδουσι και Ἡρα τε Ἀμμωνίῳ, και Παρπαμμωνί. Ἐρίμου δὲ επικλησίς ἐστιν ὁ Παρπαμμων. Pausan. in Eliac. I. c. xv. s. 7.

³ Ἐκαταίος ὁ Ἀβδηίτη ζῆσι τοῦτω και πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῷ ζήματι χρῆσθαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ὅταν τινα προκαλῶνται· προσκλητικὴν γὰρ εἰμὶ τὴν φωνήν. Plutarch. de Is. et Osir. p. 351.

Mr. Bryant says, that this was calling each other Ammonians, Pref. p. 7. Some future antiquary of this school will probably discover that the English, when they use the word Sir, mean to call each other Sirites; and thence sagaciously infer that Britain was first peopled from Siris in Italy; an inference quite as probable as most of this learned gentleman's.

⁴ Panth. Ægypt. lib. ii. c. ii. s. 12.

⁵ Ζεύς ὁ κεραστής. Hymn. x. ver. 12.

Ζεύς δὲ τε παντῶν ἐστὶ θεός, παντῶν τε κεραστής

Πνεύμασι συρίζων, φωναῖσι τε αἰρομικτοῖς.

Fragm. No. xxviii. ver. 13. ed. Gesn.

⁶ Αἰθεροπλάγκτος. Orph. Hymn. v.

⁷ Ἀλιπλάγκτος. Sophocl. Aj. 703.

⁸ Τὸν τῆς ὕλης κυρίον. Macrobi. Sat. 1. c. 22.

262 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

rector of the dances of the gods;¹ as being the author and disposer of the regular motions of the universe, of which these divine dances were symbols.² According to Pindar, this Arcadian Pan was the associate or husband of Rhea,³ and consequently the same as Saturn, with whom he seems to be confounded in the ancient coins above cited (s. 112.); some of them having the half-humanised horse, and others the figure commonly called Silenus, which is no other than Pan, in the same attitudes with the same female.

187. Among the Greeks all dancing was of the mimetic kind: wherefore Aristotle classes it with poetry, music, and painting, as being equally an imitative art;⁴ and Lucian calls it a science of imitation and exhibition, which explained the conceptions of the mind, and certified to the organs of sense things naturally beyond their reach.⁵ To such a degree of refinement was it carried, that Athenæus speaks of a Pythagorean, who could display the whole system of his sect in such gesticulations, more clearly and strongly than a professed rhetorician could in words;⁶ for the truth of which, however, we do not vouch, the attempt being sufficient. Dancing was also a part of the ceremonial in all mystic rites:⁷ whence it was held in such high esteem, that the philosopher Socrates, and the poet Sophocles, both persons of exemplary gravity, and the latter of high political rank and dignity, condescended to cultivate it as an useful and respectable accomplishment.⁸ The author of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, describes that God accompanying his lyre with the dance, joined by other deities;⁹ and a Corinthian poet, cited by Athenæus, introduces the Father of gods and men employed in

¹ Παν, Παν ὀλιγλόγῃ
Κυλλαιῆς χιονοκτύπου
Πετραίας αποδείρας, φανὴθ', ὡ
Θεῶν χοροποι' ἀναξ, ὅπως μοι
Νύσσα Κνωσσία
Ὀρχήματα αὐτοδάη
ἔνων ἰαψίης. Ajax.

² Ἡ γού χορία τῶν ἀστέρων, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ἀπλανεῖς τῶν πλανήτων συμπλοκή, καὶ εὐρυθμὸς αὐτῶν κοινωγία, καὶ εὐτακτὸς ἁρμονία, τῆς πρωτογονοῦ ὀρχήσεως δειγμάτων εἰσι.
Lucian. de Saltatione

³ Schol. in Pind. Pyth. iii. 138.

⁴ Poetic. c. i.

⁵ Μιμητικὴ τι; ἐστὶν ἀπιστήμη, καὶ δεικτική, καὶ τῶν ἐννοηθέντων ἐξαγορευτική, καὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν σαφηνιστική. Lucian. ib. s. 43.

⁶ Deipnos. lib. i. c. xvii.

⁷ Ibid.

Τελετὴν ἀρχαίων εὐδήμιον, ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν, αἰεὶ ὀρχήσεως. Lucian. ibid.

⁸ Athenæ. ib.

⁹ Ver. 194—206.

the same exercise.¹ The ancient Indians, too, paid their devotions to the Sun by a dance imitative of his motions, which they performed every morning and evening, and which was their only act of worship.² Among the Greeks the Cnosian dances were peculiarly sacred to Jupiter, as the Nyssian were to Bacchus, both of which were under the direction of Pan;³ who, being the principle of universal order, partook of the nature of all the other gods; they being personifications of particular modes of acting of the great all-ruling principle, and he of his general law of pre-established harmony; whence, upon an ancient earthen vase of Greek workmanship, he is represented playing upon a pipe, between two figures, the one male and the other female; over the latter of which is written ΝΟΟΣΣ, and over the former ΑΑΚΟΣ; whilst he himself is distinguished by the title ΜΟΑΚΟΣ: so that this composition explicitly shows him in the character of universal harmony, resulting from mind and strength; these titles being, in the ancient dialect of Magna Græcia, where the vase was found, the same as ΝΟΤΣ, ΑΑΚΗ, and ΜΟΑΠΗ, in ordinary Greek. The ancient dancing, however, which held so high a rank among liberal and sacred arts, was entirely imitative; and esteemed honorable or otherwise, in proportion to the dignity or indignity of what it was meant to express. The highest was that which exhibited military exercises and exploits with the most perfect skill, grace, and agility; excellence in which was often honored by a statue in some distinguished attitude;⁴ and we strongly suspect, that the figure commonly called "The fighting Gladiator," is one of them; there being a very decided character of individuality both in the form and features; and it would scarcely have been quite naked, had it represented any event of history.

188. Pan, like other mystic deities, was wholly unknown to the first race of poets; there being no mention of him in either the Iliad, the Odyssey, or in the genuine poem of Hesiod; and the mythologists of later times having made him a son of Mercury by Penelope, the wife of Ulysses; a fiction, perhaps, best accounted for by the conjecture of Herodotus, that the terrestrial genealogies of the mystic deities, Pan, Bacchus, and Hercules, are mere fables, bearing date from the supposed time of their becoming objects of public worship.⁵ Both in Greece and Ægypt, Pan was commonly represented under the symbo-

¹ Ib. c. xix.

² Lucian. *ibid.*

³ Sophocl. in l. c.

⁴ Athen. Deipnos. lib. xiv. c. xxvi. ed. Schweig.

⁵ Διὰ μοι οὕτω γένοιτο ὅτι ὅσους ἐπύθοντο οἱ Ἕλληνες; τοῦτων τὰ σὺμβολα, ἡ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων θῶν' ἀπ' οὗ δὲ ἐπύθοντο χρόνου, ἀπὸ τοῦτου γινώσκουσιν αὐτοὶν τῇ γινώσκῃ. Herodot. lib. ii. c. 146.

lical form of the goat half-humanised;¹ from which are derived his subordinate ministers or personified emanations, called Satyrs, Fauns, Tituri, *ΙΑΝΙΣΚΟΙ*, &c.; who, as well as their parent, were wholly unknown to the ancient poets. Neither do they appear to have been known in Ægypt, though a late traveller was so singularly fortunate as to find a mask of a Caprine Satyr upon an ancient Ægyptian lyre represented in the ancient paintings of the Thebaid; in a form, indeed, so unlike that of any ancient people, and so like to a Welsh or Irish harp, that we cannot but suspect it to be merely an embellishment of an idea that he carried out with him.² M. Denon, in his more accurate and extensive survey of the same ruins, found nothing of the kind.

189. The Nymphs, however, the corresponding emanations of the passive productive power of the universe, had been long known: for whether considered as the daughters of the Ocean or of Jupiter,³ their parent had long been enrolled among the personages of the vulgar mythology. Upon monuments of ancient art, they are usually represented with the Fauns and Satyrs, frequently in attitudes very licentious and indecent: but in the Homeric times, they seem to have been considered as guardian spirits or local deities of the springs, the vallies, and the mountains;⁴ the companions of the river gods, who were the male progeny of the Ocean;⁵ though the mystic system, as before observed, allowed them a more exalted genealogy.

190. Pan is sometimes represented ready to execute his characteristic office, and sometimes exhibiting the result of it; in the former of which, all the muscles of his face and body appear strained and contracted; and in the latter, fallen and dilated; while in both the phallus is of disproportionate magnitude, to signify that it represented the predominant attribute.⁶ In one instance, he appears pouring water upon it,⁷ but more

¹ Γραφουσι τε δη και γλυφουσι οι ζωγραφοι και οι αγαλματοποιοι του Πανος τωγαλμα, κατ'απειρ' ἑλληνας, αἰγοπροσωπων και τραγοσκελια· ουτι τοιουτον νομιζοντες ειναι μιν, αλλ' ὁμοιον τοιςι αλλοις. θ'οισι· ὅτεν δε εἵνεκα τοιουτον γραφουσι αυτον, ου μοι ἡδιον εστι λειπειν. Herodot. ii. 46.

² See print from Mr. Bruce's drawing, in Dr. Burney's History of Music.

³ Genitor Nympharum Oceanus. Catull. in Gell. v. 84. See also Callimach. Hymn. ad Dian. v. 13., and Æschyl. Prometh. Desmot.

⁴ Νυμφηι ορεστιάδες, κούραι Διὸς αἰγιοχόιο. Il. Z. 420.

Νυμφῶν, αἱ εἰχουσ' ὄρεων αἰπείνα κρηνα,
Και πηγῆς ποταμῶν, και πισσεσιν τεινέντα.

Il. Φ. 195.

⁵ Ουδε βαθυρρεῖταισσι μεγάλα σθῆθος Ὠκεανοιο
Εξ οὐ περ πάντες ποταμοί, και πασα θιλασσοα,
Και πασαι κρηναί, και φρεατα μακρὰ ναυτιν.

Odys. Z. 123.

⁶ The figures are frequent in collections of small bronzes.

⁷ Bronzi d'Ercolano, tav. xciii.

commonly standing near water, and accompanied by aquatic fowls; in which character he is confounded with Priapus, to whom geese were particularly sacred.¹ Swans, too, frequently occur as emblems of the waters upon coins; and sometimes with the head of Apollo on the reverse;² when there may be some allusion to the ancient notion of their singing; a notion which seems to have arisen from the noises which they make in the high latitudes of the North, prior to their departure at the approach of winter.³ The pedum, or pastoral hook, the symbol of attraction, and the pipe, the symbol of harmony, are frequently placed near him, to signify the means and effect of his operation.

191. Though the Greek writers call the deity who was represented by the sacred goat at Mendes, Pan, he more exactly answers to Priapus, or the generative attribute considered abstractedly;⁴ which was usually represented in Ægypt, as well as in Greece, by the phallus only.⁵ This deity was honored with a place in most of their temples,⁶ as the lingam is in those of the Hindoos; and all the hereditary priests were initiated or consecrated to him, before they assumed the sacerdotal office:⁷ for he was considered as a sort of accessory attribute to all the other divine personifications, the great end and purpose of whose existence was generation or production. A part of the worship offered both to the goat Mendes, and the bull Apis, consisted in the women tendering their persons to him, which it seems the former often accepted, though the taste of the latter was too correct.⁸ An attempt seems to have been made, in early times, to introduce similar acts of devotion in Italy; for when the oracle of Juno was consulted upon the long-continued barrenness of the Roman matrons, its answer was, "Iliadas matres caper hntus imito:" but these mystic refinements not being understood by that rude people, they could think of no other way of fulfilling the mandate, than sacrificing a goat, and

¹ Petri mii Satyric. cxxvi.—vii.

² See coins of Clazomenæ in Pellerin, and Mus. Hunter.

³ Ol. Rudbeck. Atlant. p. in c. v. p. 249. Ol. Magn. lib. iv. c. xv.

⁴ Τον δε τραγον ατιθειωσαν (Λιγυπτιω.) καθυμνεις και περιετοι; Ελψισι τιτιμνησθαι λεγουσι τον Πριαπον, οια το γεννητικον μοριον. Diodor. Sic. lib. i. p. 78.

⁵ Ibid. p. 16.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Τους τε ιερεις τους παραλαβοντας πατρικας ιερωνυνας κατ' Λιγυπτον, ουτω τω θεω τραπον μιμισθαι. Ibid. p. 78.

⁸ Μεινδητα παρα κρημον, θαλασσης οχλωτον,

Νηλου κρας, αιγιβοται οθι τραγοι γλυα.ξει μισηγονται.

Pindar. apud Strabon. xvii. p. 862.

Γυναικι τραγος εμισγετο αναφανδον τουτο ες επιδειξει ανθρωπων απικετο. Herodot. lib. ii. s. 46.

266 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

applying the skin, cut into thongs, to the bare backs of the ladies.

—————Jussæ sua terga maritæ
Pellibus exsectis percutienda dabant;

which, however, had the desired effect :

Virque pater subito, nuptaque mater erat.¹

At Mendes female goats were also held sacred, as symbols of the passive generative attribute;² and on Grecian monuments of art, we often find caprine satyrs of that sex. The fable of Jupiter having been suckled by a goat, probably arose from some emblematical composition; the true explanation of which was only known to the initiated. Such was the Juno Sospita of Lanuvium, near Rome, whose goat-skin dress signified the same as her title; and who, on a votive car of very ancient Etruscan work found near Perugia, appears exactly in the form described by Cicero, as the associate of Hercules dressed in the lion's skin, or the Destroyer.³

192. The Greeks frequently combined the symbolical animals, especially in engravings upon gems, where we often find the forms of the ram, goat, horse, cock, and various others, blended into one, so as to form Pantheic compositions, signifying the various attributes and modes of action of the Deity.⁴ Cupid is sometimes represented wielding the mask of Pan, and sometimes playing upon a lyre, while sitting upon the back of a lion;⁵ devices of which the ænigmatical meaning has been already sufficiently explained in the explanations of the component parts. The Hindoos, and other nations of the eastern parts of Asia, expressed similar combinations of attributes by symbols loosely connected, and figures unskilfully composed of many heads, legs, arms, &c.; which appear from the epithets hundred-headed, hundred-handed, &c., so frequent in the old Greek poets, to have been not wholly unknown to them; though the objects to which they are applied prove that their ideas were taken from figures

Εν δὲ ταῖς προσηρμηνυμέναις τετταρακονθ' ἡμέραις μόνον ὄρωσιν αὐτοὶ (τὸν Ἀπὶν) αἱ γυναῖκες, κατὰ πρόσωπον ἰσταμέναι, καὶ δεξινοῦσι ἀνασυρμέναι τὰ ἑαυτῶν γυνητικὰ μόρια· τὸν δ' ἄλλοτε χρόνον ἅπαντα κικυλωμένον ἔστιν εἰς ὅψιν αὐτὰς ἐρχισθαὶ τοῦτῃ τῷ θεῷ. Diodor. Sic. lib. i.

¹ Ovid. Fast. ii. 448.

² Αἰγὴ δὲ καὶ τραγὸν Μινθῆσιν τιμῶσιν. Strabon. lib. xvii. p. 812.

³ Σιβόνται δὲ πάντα τοὺς αἰγᾶς οἱ Μινθῆσιοι, καὶ μάλλον τοὺς ἀρσίνους τῶν θηλειῶν. Herodot. lib. ii. s. 46.

⁴ Cum pelle caprina, cum hasta, cum scutulo, cum calceolis repandis. De N. D. lib. i. s. xxix.

⁵ They are common, and to be found in all collections of gems; but never upon coins.

⁶ See Mus. Florent. gemm.

which they did not understand, and which they therefore exaggerated into fabulous monsters, the enemies or arbitrators of their own gods.¹ Such symbolical figures may, perhaps, have been worshipped in the western parts of Asia, when the Greeks first settled there; of which the Diana of Ephesus appears to have been a remain: for both her temple and that of the Apollo Didymæus were long anterior to the Ionic emigration;² though the composite images of the latter, which now exist, are, as before observed, among the most refined productions of Grecian taste and elegance. A Pantheic bust of this kind is engraved in plates lv. and lvi. of Vol. i. of the Select Specimens, having the dewlaps of a goat, the ears of a bull, and the claws of a crab placed as horns upon his head. The hair appears wet; and out of the temples spring fish, while the whole of the face and breast is covered with foliage that seems to grow from the flesh; signifying the result of this combination of attributes in fertilising and organising matter. The Bacchus *ΔΕΝΑΠΙΘΗΣ*, and Neptune *ΦΤΤΑΑΜΙΟΣ*,³ the one the principle of vegetation in trees, and the other in plants, were probably represented by composite symbolical images of this kind.

193. A female Pantheic figure in silver, with the borders of the drapery plated with gold, and the whole finished in a manner surpassing almost any thing extant, was among the things found at Macon on the Saone, in the year 1764, and published by Count Caylus.⁴ It represents Cybele, the universal mother, with the mural crown on her head, and the wings of pervasion growing from her shoulders, mixing the productive elements of heat and moisture, by making a libation upon the flames of an altar from a golden patera, with the usual knob in the centre of it, representing, probably, the lingam. On each side of her

¹ Il. A. 402. Pindar. Pyth. i. 31., viii. 20.

² From the publication of Denon of the sculptures remaining in Upper Ægypt, it seems that such figures had a place in the ancient religious mythology of that country.

³ Το δε Ιερον το εν Διδυμοις του Απολλωνος, και το μαντειον εστιν αρχαιοτερον η κατω της Ιωνης ισοικητιν πολλω δε περισβυτερη επι η κατω Ιωνας τα εις την Αρτεμιν Φην Εφισιαν. Pausan. Achaic. c. ii. s. iv.

⁴ Αμφοτεροι γαρ οι θεοι της υγρας και γοιμου κυριοι δοκουσιν αρχης ειναι και Προσιδανει γε Φυταλμιω Διονυσω δε Διενδριτη, παντες, ως επος ειπεν, Έλληνις θυουσιν. Plutarch. Sympos. lib. v. qu. 111.

⁵ T. vii. pl. lxxi.

He says that the figure had been gilt all over: but he is mistaken; no part of it having been gilt, but several plated, all which remain entire, with the gold upon them. It is now, with most of the other small figures in silver, found with it, in the cabinet of Mr. Knight.

head is one of the Dioscuri, signifying the alternate influence of the diurnal and nocturnal sun; and, upon a crescent supported by the tips of her wings, are the seven planets, each signified by a bust of its presiding deity resting upon a globe, and placed in the order of the days of the week named after them. In her left hand she holds two cornucopias, to signify the result of her operation on the two hemispheres of the Earth; and upon them are the busts of Apollo and Diana, the presiding deities of those hemispheres, with a golden disk, intersected by two transverse lines, such as is observable on other pieces of ancient art, and such as the barbarians of the North employed to represent the solar year, divided into four parts,¹ at the back of each.

194. How the days of the week came to be called by the names of the planets, or why the planets were thus placed in an order so different from that of nature, and even from that in which any theorist ever has placed them, is difficult to conjecture. The earliest notice of it in any ancient writing now extant, is in the work of an historian of the beginning of the third century of Christianity;² who says that it was unknown to the Greeks, and borrowed by the Romans from other nations, who divided the planets on this occasion by a sort of musical scale, beginning with Saturn, the most remote from the centre, and then passing over two to the Sun, and two more to the Moon, and so on, till the arrangement of the week was complete as at present, only beginning with the day which now stands last. Other explanations are given, both by the same and by later writers; but as they appear to us to be still more remote from probability, it will be sufficient to refer to them, without entering into further details.³ Perhaps the difficulty has arisen from a confusion between the deities and the planets; the ancient nations of the North having consecrated each day of the week to some principal personage of their mythology, and called it after his name, beginning with Lok or Saturn, and ending with Freia or Venus: whence, when these, or the corresponding names in other languages, were applied both to the planets and to the days of the week consecrated to them, the ancient mythological order of the titles was retained, though the ideas expressed by them were no longer religious, but astronomical. Perhaps, too, it may be accounted for from the

¹ Ol. Rudbeck. *Atlant.* vol. i. p. 90.. and vol. ii. p. 212. fig. 4., and p. 161 and 2.

² The part of Plutarch's *Symposiacs*, in which it was discussed, is unfortunately lost.

³ Cass. Dion. lib. xxxvi. p. 37. Hyde de Relig. vet. Persar. c. v. ad fin.

Ptolemaic system; according to which the order of the planets was, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon: for if the natural day consisted of twenty-four hours, and each hour was under the influence of a planet in succession, and the first hour of Saturday be sacred to Saturn, the eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-second, will be so likewise; so that the twenty-third will belong to Jupiter, the twenty-fourth to Mars, and the first hour of the next day to the Sun. In the same manner, the first hour of the ensuing day will belong to the Moon, and so on through the week, according to the seemingly capricious order in which all nations, using the hebdomadal computation of time, have placed them.

195. The Disa or Isa of the North was represented by a conic figure enveloped in a net, similar to the cortina of Apollo on the medals of Cos, Chersonesus in Crete, Naples in Italy, and the Syrian kings; but instead of having the serpent coiled round it, as in the first, or some symbol or figure of Apollo placed upon it, as in the rest, it is terminated in a human head.¹ This goddess is unquestionably the Isis whom the ancient Suevi, according to Tacitus, worshipped;² for the initial letter of the first name appears to be an article or prefix joined to it; and the Egyptian Isis was occasionally represented enveloped in a net, exactly as the Scandinavian goddess was at Upsal.³ This goddess is delineated on the sacred drums of the Laplanders, accompanied by a child, similar to the Horus of the Egyptians, who so often appears in the lap of Isis on the religious monuments of that people.⁴ The ancient Muscovites also worshipped a sacred group, composed of an old woman with one male child in her lap and another standing by her, which probably represented Isis and her offspring. They had likewise another idol, called the golden heifer, which seems to have been the animal symbol of the same personage.⁵

196. Common observation would teach the inhabitants of polar climates that the primitive state of water was ice; the name of which, in all the northern dialects, has so near an affinity with that of the goddess, that there can be no doubt of their having been originally the same, though it is equally a title of the corresponding personification in the East Indies. The conic form also unquestionably means the egg; there being in the

¹ Ol. Rudbeck, Atlant. vol. ii. c. v. p. 219.

² De M. G. c. ix.

³ Isiac Table, and Ol. Rudbeck. ib. p. 209 and 210.

⁴ Ib. p. 280.

⁵ Ib. c. vi. p. 512 and 513.

Albani collection a statue of Apollo sitting upon a great number of eggs, with a serpent coiled round them, exactly as he is upon the veiled cone or cortina, round which the serpent is occasionally coiled, upon the coins above cited. A conic pile of eggs is also placed by the statue of him, draped, as he appears on a silver tetradrachm of Lampsacus,¹ engraved in pl. lxii. of vol. i. of the Select Specimens.

197. Stones of a similar conic form are represented upon the colonial medals of Tyre, and called ambrosial stones; from which, probably, came the ambers, so frequent all over the northern hemisphere. These, from the remains still extant, appear to have been composed of one of these cones let into the ground, with another stone placed upon the point of it, and so nicely balanced, that the wind could move it, though so ponderous that no human force, unaided by machinery, can displace it: whence they are now called logging rocks, and pendre stones,² as they were anciently living stones, and stones of God;³ titles, which differ but little in meaning from that on the Tyrian coins. Damascius saw several of them in the neighborhood of Heliopolis or Baalbeck, in Syria; particularly one which was then moved by the wind;⁴ and they are equally found in the western extremities of Europe, and the eastern extremities of Asia, in Britain and in China.⁵ Probably the stone which the patriarch Jacob anointed with oil, according to a mode of worship once generally practised,⁶ as it still is by the Hindoos, was of this kind.⁷ Such immense masses being moved by causes seeming so inadequate, must naturally have conveyed the idea of spontaneous motion to ignorant observers, and persuaded them that they were animated by an emanation of the vital Spirit: whence they were consulted as oracles, the responses of which could always be easily obtained by interpreting the different oscillatory movements into nods of approbation and dissent. The figures of the Apollo Didymæus, on the Syrian coins above-mentioned, are placed sitting upon the point of the cone, where the more rude and primitive symbol of the logging rock is found poised;

¹ In the cabinet of Mr. Payne Knight. ² Norden's Cornwall, p. 79.

³ Λιθοὶ ἐμφυχοὶ ἐν βαιτυλῖα. Pseudo-Sanchon. Fragm. apud Euseb. The last title seems to be a corruption of the scriptural name Bethel.

⁴ Εἶδον τὸν βαιτυλὸν δια τοῦ ἀέρος κινουμένον. In Vitâ Isidori apud Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 212.

⁵ Norden. ib. Kercheri China illustrata, p. 270.

⁶ Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. p. 713. : Arnob. lib. i. : Herodian. in Macriso.

⁷ Cleric. Comm. in Genes. c. xviii. v. 22.

and we are told, in a passage¹ before cited, that the oracle of this god near Miletus existed before the emigration of the Ionian colonies; that is, more than eleven hundred years before the Christian æra: wherefore we are persuaded that it was originally nothing more than one of these *βαιτυλῖα* or symbolical groups; which the luxury of wealth and refinement of art gradually changed into a most magnificent temple and most elegant statue.

198. There were anciently other sacred piles of stones, equally or perhaps more frequent all over the North, called by the Greeks *ΛΟΦΟΙ Ἑρμῆαί* or hillocks of Mercury;² of whom they were probably the original symbols. They were placed by the sides, or in the points of intersection, of roads; where every traveller that passed, threw a stone upon them in honor of Mercury, the guardian of all ways or general conductor;³ and there can be no doubt that many of the ancient crosses observable in such situations were erected upon them; their pyramidal form affording a commodious base, and the substituting a new object being the most obvious and usual remedy for such kinds of superstition. The figures of this god sitting upon fragments of rock or piles of stone, one of which has been already cited, are probably more elegant and refined modes of signifying the same ideas.

199. The old Pelasgian Mercury of the Athenians consisted, as before observed, of a human head placed upon an inverted obelisk with a phallus; of which several are extant; as also of a female draped figure terminating below in the same square form. These seem to be of the Venus Architis, or primitive Venus; of whom there was a statue in wood at Delos, supposed to be the work of Dædalus;³ and another in a temple upon Mount Libanus, of which Macrobius's description exactly corresponds with the figures now extant; of which one is given in plate lviii. of vol. i. of the Select Specimens. "Her appearance," he says, "was melancholy, her head covered, and her face sustained by her left hand, which was concealed under her garment."⁴ Some

¹ ———— ὑπὲρ πολλοῖς, ὅθι Ἑρμῆας λοφος ἐστίν. *Odyss.* II. 471. This line, however, together with those adjoining 468 75, though ancient, is proved to be an interpolation of much later date than the rest of the poem, by the word Ἑρμῆας formed from the contracted Ἑρμῆς for Ἑρμῆας, unknown to the Homeric tongue.

² *Anthol. lib. iv. Epigr. 12. Phurnut. de nat. Deor.*

³ Καὶ Ἀθηναῖοις Ἀφροδίτης ἐστὶν οὐ μὲγα ξοῦνον (τιχὴν Δαιδαλοῦ) κατισσι δὲ αὐτὴ ποδῶν τετραγωνοῦ σχήμα. *Paus. in Bæot. c. xi. s. 2.*

⁴ Capite obnupto, specie tristi, faciem manu læva intus amictum sustinens. *Sat. c. 21.*

of these figures have the mystic title *ΑΣΠΑΣΙΑ* upon them, signifying perhaps the welcome or gratulation to the returning spring: for they evidently represent nature in winter, still sustained by the inverted obelisk, the emanation of the sun pointed downwards; but having all her powers enveloped in gloom and sadness. Some of these figures were probably, like the Paphian Venus, androgynous; whence arose the Hermaphrodite; afterwards represented under more elegant forms, accounted for as usual by poetical fables. Occasionally the attribute seems to be signified by the cap and wings of Mercury.

200. The symbol of the ram was, it seems, explained in the Eleusinian mysteries;¹ and the nature and history of the Pelasgian Mercury in those of Samothrace;² the device on whose coins, is his emblem either of the ram or the cock;³ and where he was distinguished by the mystic title Casmilus or Cadmilus;⁴ of which, probably, the Latin word Camillus, and the Greek name of the fabulous hero Cadmus are equally abbreviations;⁵ for the stories of this hero being married to Harmony, the daughter of Mars and Venus; and of both him and his wife being turned into serpents, are clearly allegorical; and it is more probable that the colony which occupied Thebes, were called Cadmeians from the title of their deity than from the name of their chief.

201. The Ægyptian Mercury carried a branch of palm in his hand, which his priests also wore in their Saudals,⁶ probably as a badge of their consecration to immortality: for this tree is mentioned in the Orphic poems as proverbial for longevity; and was the only one known to the ancients, which never changed its leaves; all other evergreens shedding them, though not regularly nor all at once.⁷ It has also the property of flourishing in the most parched and dry situations; where no other large trees

¹ Pausan. lib. ii. c. 3.

² Herodot. lib. ii. c. 51.

³ Mus. Hunter. tab. xlv. fig. 21. et nummul. argent. ined. apud R. P. Knight, Londini.

⁴ Μουσονται δὲ ἐν τῇ Σαμοθρακίᾳ τοῖς Καβείροις, ἂν Μνασείας φησὶ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα. Τισσάρες δὲ εἰσι τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ. Ἀξίερο, Ἀξιοκέρσα, Ἀξιοκίσος. Ἀξίερος μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ Δημήτηρ· Ἀξιοκέρσα δὲ ἡ Περσεφονή· Ἀξιοκίσος δὲ ὁ Ἄϊης. ὁ δὲ προστιθίμενος τεταρτὸς Κασμῖλος· ὁ Ἑρμῆς ἐστίν, ὡς ἴστωρις Διονυσιοδώρος. Schol. in Apoll. Rhod. lib. I. v. 917.

Οἱ δὲ προστιθίσιναι καὶ τεταρτὸν Καδμῖλον, ἐστὶ δ' οὗτος ὁ Ἑρμῆς. *ibid.*

⁵ Lycophron. v. 162. Καδμῖλος· ὁ Ἑρμῆς Βωιωτικῶς. schol. in eund. et κατὰ συγκατάνη Καδμῖλον. *ib.* in v. 219.

⁶ Apuleii Metam. lib. iii. p. 39. et lib. xi. p. 241 et 246.

⁷ Ὁ δὲ φερεῖσθαι ἀποβιβάων καὶ αὐτοῦ των φουμένων, βεβαίως αἰφυλλος ἐστὶ, καὶ οὕτω δὴ τὸ κρεῖστον καὶ τοῦ μάλιστα τῆς νικῆς τῷ ἰσχυρῷ συγκαίουσιν. Plutarch, Sympos. lib. viii. probl. 4.

will grow ; and therefore might naturally have been adopted as a vegetable symbol of the sun ; whence it frequently accompanies the horse on the coins of Carthage ;¹ and in the Corinthian Sacristy in the temple at Delphi was a bronze palm-tree with frogs and water-snakes round its root, signifying the sun fed by humidity.² The pillars in many ancient Ægyptian temples, represent palm-trees with their branches lopped off ; and it is probable that the palm-trees in the temple of Solomon were pillars of the same form ;³ that prince having admitted many prophane symbols among the ornaments of his sacred edifice. • The palm-tree at Delos, sacred to Apollo and Diana, is mentioned in the Odyssey ;⁴ and it seems probable that the games and other exercises performed in honor of those deities, in which the palm, the laurel, and other symbolical plants were the distinctions of victory, were originally mystic representations of the attributes and modes of action of the divine nature. Such the dances unquestionably were : for when performed in honor of the gods, they consisted chiefly of imitative exhibitions of the symbolical figures under which they were represented by the artists.⁵ Simple mimicry seems also to have formed a part of the very ancient games celebrated by the Ionians at Delos ;⁶ from which, probably, came dramatic poetry ; the old comedy principally consisting of imitations, not only of individual men, but of the animals employed as symbols of the Deity.⁷ Of this kind are the comedies of the birds, the frogs, the wasps, &c. ; the choral parts of which were recited by persons who were disguised in imitation of those different animals, and who mimicked their notes while chanting or singing the parts.⁸ From a passage of Æschylus, preserved by Strabo, it appears that similar imitations were practised in the mystic ceremonies,⁹

¹ See Gesner. tab. lxxiv. fig. 40 and 42.

² Την ἐξ ὕδατος κρηττοτον του ἡλίου και γενεσιν και αναθυμιασιν ὁ δημιουργος. Plutarch. de meteo non utente Pyth. dialog.

³ See Pococke's Travels, vol. i. p. 217. 4 Z. 162.

⁵ Ἡ γὰρ ὀρχησις ἐκ τῆς κινήσεως και σχήσεως συνίστηται — φορεῖς μὲν οὖν τὰς κινήσεις, ὀνομαζοῦσι, σχήματα δὲ σχήσεις και διαθίσεις, εἰς ἃς φεροῦνται τὸ ἔλκυσμα αἱ κινήσεις, ὅταν Ἀπολλωνος, ἡ Πανος, ἡ τινος Βακχίης, σχήματα διαθίτες ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος γρηγορικῶς τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπιμνησκῶσιν. Plutarch. Sympos. lib. ix. probl. 15.

⁶ Πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνῶν και κινήσεων μιμήσεσθαι. Hom. Hymn. in Apoll. 162.

⁷ See Aristoph. Ἰππ. 520, &c. ⁸ Εἰς τὴν Βατράχ. 209.

⁹ ψαλμός δ' ἀλλελαζει, ταυροφθογγοὶ δ' ὑπομικνῶνται κοθὲν ἐξ ἀφηνούς φοβέριον μιμνῶν

274 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

which may have been a reason for their gradual disuse upon all common occasions.

202. The symbolical meaning of the olive, the fir, and the apples, the honorary rewards in the Olympic, Isthmian, and Pythian games, has been already noticed; and the parsley, which formed the crown of the Roman victors, was equally a mystic plant; it being represented on coins in the same manner as the fig-leaf, and with the same signification,¹ probably on account of a peculiar influence, which it is still supposed to have upon the female constitution. This connexion of the games with the mystic worship was probably one cause of the momentous importance attached to success in them; which is frequently spoken of by persons of the highest rank, as the most splendid object of human ambition;² and we accordingly find the proud city of Syracuse bribing a citizen of Caulonia to renounce his own country and proclaim himself of theirs, that they might have the glory of a prize which he had obtained.³ When Exænetus of Agrigentum won the race in the ninety-second Olympiad, he was escorted into his native city by three hundred chariots;⁴ and Theagenes the Thasian, the Achilles of his age, who long possessed unrivalled superiority in all exercises of bodily strength and agility, so as to have been crowned fourteen hundred times, was canonised as a hero or demigod, had statues erected to him in various parts of Greece, and received divine worship; which he further proved himself worthy of, by miraculous favors obtained at his altars. Euthymus too, who was equally eminent as a boxer, having won a great number of prizes, and contended once even against Theagenes with doubtful success, was rewarded with equal or even greater honors: for he was deified by command of the oracle even before his death;⁵ being thus elevated to a rank, which fear has often prostituted to power; but which unawed respect gave to merit in this instance only: and it is peculiarly degrading to popular favor and flattery that in this instance it should have been given not to the labors of a statesman or the wisdom of a legislator, but to the dexterity of a boxer.

203. This custom of canonising or deifying men seems to have

τυμπανῷ δ' ἤχῳ,
ὡςθ' ὑπογείου βροντῆς, φέρεται βαρυταβῆς.

Æschyl. *Edon.* apud Strab. lib. x. p. 719.

¹ Σίλινον. το γυναικίσιον. Hesych.

² Sophocl. *Electr.* Platon. *Polit.* lib. v. p. 419.

⁴ Diodor. *Sic.* lib. xiii. c. 82.

³ Pausan. lib. vi. c. 3.

⁵ Plin. lib. vii. c. 47.

arisen from that general source of ancient rites and opinions, the system of emanations; according to which all were supposed to partake of the divine essence, but not in an equal degree: whence, while a few simple rites, faintly expressive of religious veneration, were performed in honor of all the dead,¹ a direct and explicit worship was paid to the shades of certain individuals renowned for either great virtues or great vices, which, if equally energetic, equally dazzle and overawe the gaping multitude.² Every thing being derived, according to this system, from the Deity, the commanding talents and splendid qualities of particular persons were naturally supposed to proceed from particular emanations; whence such persons were, even while living, honored with divine titles expressive of those particular attributes of the Deity, with which they seemed to be peculiarly favored.³ Such titles were, however, in many instances given soon after birth; children being named after the divine personifications, as a sort of consecration to their protection. The founder of the Persian monarchy was called by a name, which in their language signified the sun;⁴ and there is no doubt that many of the ancient kings of Ægypt had names of the same kind;⁵ which have helped to confound history with allegory; though the Ægyptians, prior to their subjection to the Macedonians, never worshipped them, nor any heroes or canonised mortals whatsoever.⁶

204. "During the Pagan state of the Irish," says a learned antiquary of that country, "every child at his birth received a name generally from some imaginary divinity; under whose protection it was supposed to be: but this name was seldom retained longer than the state of infancy; from which period it was generally

¹ Odyss. A. Lucian. περι πνεθ. s. 9.

² Θαλής, Πυθαγόρας, Πλάτων, οἱ Στωϊκοὶ Δαίμονας ὑπαρχεῖν οὐσίας ψυχικάς· εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἥρωας τὰς κεχωρισμένας ψυχὰς τῶν σωματῶν, καὶ ἀγαθοὺς μὲν, τὰς ἀγαθὰς· κακοὺς δὲ, τὰς φαύλας. Plutarch. de Placit. Philos. lib. i. c. 8.

—οἱ γὰρ ἥρωες κακοὺν,
ὥς φασ', εἰσὶ μοι μάλλον, ἢ εὐεργετεῖν.

Menan. l. r. ex Æqual. Fragm.

³ ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θειῶν γένος· ἐκ
μίας δὲ πνεομένη
ματρός ἀμφοτέροι.
διεργεῖ δὲ πᾶσα κεκρίμενα
δύναμις.

Pindar. Nem. 5. v. 1.

⁴ Καὶ τιθίται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (Κυροῦ) ἀπο τοῦ ἡλίου. Ctes. Persic.
Κυρον γὰρ καλεῖν Περσας τὸν ἥλιον. Plutarch. in Artax.

Τὸν γὰρ ἥλιον Πέρσαι Κυρον λεγούσι. Hæsyeh.

⁵ See Jablonk. Panth. Ægypt.

⁶ Νομίζουσι δ' ὡν Αἰγυπτίαι οὐδ' ἡρώσιν οὐδεν. Herodot. lib. ii. s. 50. See also s. 142 and 3.

276 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

changed for others arising from some perfection or imperfection of the body; the disposition or quality of the mind; achievements in war or the chase; the place of birth, residence, &c.”¹ When these descriptive titles exactly accorded with those previously imposed, and derived from the personified attributes of the Deity, both were naturally confounded; and the limited excellences of man thus occasionally placed in the same rank with the boundless perfections of God. The same custom still prevails among the Hindoos, who when a child is ten days old give him the name of one of their Deities; to whose favor they think by this mean to recommend him;² whence the same medley of historical tradition and physical allegory fills up their popular creed, as filled that of the Greeks and other nations. The ancient theism of the North seems also to have been corrupted by the conqueror Odin assuming the title of the supreme God, and giving those of other subordinate attributes to his children and captains;³ which are, however, all occasionally applied to him:⁴ for the Scandinavians, like the Greeks, seem sometimes to have joined, and sometimes to have separated the personifications; so that they sometimes worshipped several gods, and sometimes only one god with several names.

205. Historical tradition has transmitted to us accounts of several ancient kings, who bore the Greek name of Jupiter;⁵ which signifying Awe or Terror, would naturally be assumed by tyrants, who wished to inspire such sentiments. The ancient Bacchus was said to have been the son of Jupiter by Ceres or Proserpine;⁶ that is, in plain language, the result of the æthereal Spirit operating upon the Earth, or its pervading Heat: but a

¹ Collectan. Hibern. No. xi. p. 259.

² Sonnerat Voyage aux Indes. T. 1. p. 84.

³ Mallet Introd. à l'Hist. de Danemar.

⁴ *Odinus* ego nunc nominor;
Yggus modo nominabar;
Vocabar Thundus ante id,
Vacus et Skilfingus,
Vafodur et Hoopta-tyr
Gautus et Iulcus inter Deos,
Ossier et Suafner;
Quos puta factos esse
Omnes ex uno me.

Grunnismal liii. Edd. Sæmond. p. 61.

⁵ Παντας μιν ουν καταριθμησασθαι και προθυμηθεντι απορνει, οπως θελουσι γενεσθαι και τραπενηναι παντα σφισι Δια. Pausan. in Mæssen. c. xxviii. s. 2.

⁶ Φασι τον θεον (τον Διουισον) εκ Διως και Δημητρος τεκνωθεντι. διασπαισθηται. Diodor. Sic. lib. iii.

real or fictitious hero, having been honored with his name in the Cadmean colony of Thebes, was by degrees confounded with him in the popular mythology; and fabled to have been raised up by Jupiter to replace him after he had been slain by the Titans;¹ as Attis and Adonis were by the boar, and Osiris by Typhon; symbolical tales which have been already noticed. The mystic Deity was however duly distinguished as an object of public worship in the temples: where he was associated by the Greeks with Ceres and Proserpine,² and by the Romans with Ceres and Libera, (who was their Proserpine,) the reason for which, as the Stoic interlocutor observes in Cicero's Dialogue on the Nature of the Gods, was explained in the Mysteries.³

206. The sons of Tyndarus were by the same means confounded with the ancient personifications of the diurnal and nocturnal sun, or of the morning and evening star;⁴ the symbols of whose attributes, the two oval or conic caps, were interpreted to signify their birth from Leda's egg, a fable ingrafted upon the old allegory subsequent to the Homeric times; the four lines alluding to the deification of the brothers of Helen in the Odyssey being undoubtedly spurious, though extremely beautiful.⁵ Perseus is probably an entirely fictitious and allegorical personage; for there is no mention of him in either of the Homeric poems; and his name is a title of the sun,⁶ and his image the composite

Ἀθηναῖοι Διόνυσον τὸν Δίος καὶ Κόρης σεβουσιν· ἄλλον τούτου Διόνυσον καὶ ὁ Ἰακχὸς ὁ μυστικός τούτῳ τῷ Διόνυσῳ, οὐχὶ τῷ Θηβαίῳ, ἐπεδίδται. Arrian. lib. ii. An Attic writer during the independence of the Republic, would not have dared to say so much.

Μυθολογοῦσι δὲ τινες καὶ ἕτερον Διόνυσον γενέσθαι, πολὺ τοῖς χρόνοις προτερουντα τούτου· φασὶ γὰρ ἐκ Δίος καὶ Περσεφόνης Διόνυσον γενέσθαι, τὸν ὑπὸ τινῶν Σεβασίων ὀνομαζομένον· οὗ τῇ γενέσει καὶ τῆς θυσίας καὶ τιμῆς νυκτερινῆς καὶ κρυφίας παρειαγοῦσι διὰ τὴν αἰσχρὴν τὴν ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας ἐπακλουθούσαν. Diodor. Sic. lib. iv. p. 118.

Σαββους γὰρ καὶ νῦν ἐτι πολλοὶ τοὺς Βακκικοὺς καλοῦσι, καὶ ταυτὴν ἀφ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὴν φωνὴν ὅτι ν ὀργιάζωσι τῷ θεῷ. Plutarch. Symp. lib. iv. qu. vi.

¹ Ἦδη γὰρ μενιαινεῖν νῖον Διόνυσον αἰεῖν,
Ταυροφύης μίμημα παλαιγενέος Διόνυσου,
Λινομορῶν Ἰνυγρὸς ἔχων ποδῶν ὑψιμέδων Ζεὺς,
Ὅν τετι Περσεφόνηα δρακοντιῇ Δίος ἐνυη. Dionysiac. lib. v. p. 173.

² Καὶ πλησίον νῖος ἐστὶ Δημήτριος· ἀγάλματα δὲ αὐτῇ τε καὶ ἡ Παῖς, καὶ ὄρεα ἔχων Ἰακχός. Pausan. in Attic.

Ἡ πόλις γ' ἐν ἐτι τῷ Π. αἰετιλοῦς Δημήτρεα, καὶ Κόρην, καὶ τὸν Ἰακχὸν τὸν μυστικόν, θεοὺς ὑπολαμβάνομεν. Cleus. Alex. in Protrep.

³ Lib. iii. s. 21.

⁴ Καὶ τοὺς Τυνδάρειδας δὲ φασὶ τὴν τῶν Διοσκουρῶν δοξάν ὑπὲρ θέναι πάλιν (lege παλαι) νομιζομένων εἶναι θένων. Scal. Empir. lib. A. s. 37.

⁵ Od. A. 300—4. λαλοχχός· σα βεταγ· the interpolator, the adjective having been written with the digamma.

⁶ Περσεύς· ὁ ἥλιος. Schol. in Lycoph. v. 18.

278 *An Inquiry into the Symbolical Language*

symbol of the gryphon humanised. Theseus appears likewise to be a personage who started into being between the respective ages of the two Homeric poems: there being no mention of him in the genuine parts of the *Iliad*, though the Athenian genealogy is minutely detailed;¹ and he being only once slightly mentioned as the lover of Ariadne in the genuine parts of the *Odyssey*.² He seems, in reality, to be the Athenian personification of Hercules; he having the same symbols of the club and lion's skin; and similar actions and adventures being attributed to him, many of which are manifestly allegorical; such as his conflict with the Minotaur, with the Centaurs, and with the Amazons.

207. This confusion of personages, arising from a confusion of names, was facilitated in its progress by the belief that the universal generative principle, or its subordinate emanations, might act in such a manner as that a female of the human species might be impregnated without the co-operation of a male;³ and as this notion was extremely useful and convenient in concealing the frailties of women, quieting the jealousies of husbands, protecting the honor of families, and guarding with religious awe the power of bold usurpers, it was naturally cherished and promoted with much favor and industry. Men supposed to be produced in this supernatural way, would of course advance into life with strong confidence and high expectations; which generally realise their own views, when supported by even common courage and ability. Such were the founders of almost all the families distinguished in mythology; whose names being, like all other ancient names, descriptive titles, they were equally applicable to the personified attributes of the Deity: whence both became blended together; and historical so mixed with allegorical fable, that it is impossible in many instances to distinguish or separate them. The actions of kings and conquerors were attributed to personages purely symbolical; and the qualities of these bestowed in return upon frail and perishable mortals. Even the double or ambiguous sex was attributed to deified heroes; Cecrops being fabled to have been both man and woman;⁴ and the rough Hercules and furious Achilles represented with the features and habits of the softer sex, to conceal

¹ B. 546—50. Several of these lines seem to have been interpolated in compliment to the Athenians.

² A. 321.

³ Ουθεν οιομαι δεινον, ει μη πλησιαζων ο θεος, ως περ ανθρωπος, αλλα ιτεραις τιτιν αφαις δι' ιτερων και φανσιαις τρεπει, και υποσιμπλησι θειωτερας γονης το γνητον. Plutarch. *Symposiac.* lib. viii. probl. 1.

⁴ Justin. lib. ii. c. 6. Suidas in Κεκροχ. Euseb. et Hieron. in *Chronic.* Plutarch. *de sera numin. vindicta.* Eustath. in *Dionys.* Diodor. Sic. l. i. c. 28.

the mystic meaning of which the fables of Omphale and Iole, and the daughters of Lycomedes, were invented ; of which there is not a trace in the Homeric poems.

208. When the Greeks made expeditions into distant countries either for plunder, trade, or conquest ; and there found deified heroes with titles corresponding either in sound or sense to their own, they without further inquiry concluded them to be the same ; and adopted all the legendary tales which they found with them : whence their own mythology, both religious and historical, was gradually spread out into an unwieldy mass of incoherent fictions and traditions, that no powers of ingenuity or extent of learning could analyse or comprehend. The heroes of the *Iliad* were, at a very early period, so much the objects of public adoration, partly through the greatness of the war, the only one carried on jointly by all the States of Greece prior to the Macedonian usurpation, and partly through the refulgent splendor of the mighty genius by which it had been celebrated ; that the proudest princes were ambitious of deducing their genealogies from them, and the most powerful nations vain of any traces of connexion with them. Many such claims and pretensions were of course fabricated, which were as easily asserted as denied ; and as men have a natural partiality for affirmatives, and nearly as strong a predilection for that which exercises their credulity, as for that which gratifies their vanity, we may conclude that the assertors generally prevailed. Their tales were also rendered plausible, in many instances, by the various traditions then circulated concerning the subsequent fortunes and adventures of those heroes ; some of whom were said to have been cast away in their return ; and others expelled by usurpers, who had taken advantage of their long absence ; so that a wandering life supported by piracy and plunder became the fate of many.¹ Inferences were likewise drawn from the slenderest traces of verbal analogies, and the general similarity of religious rites ; which, as they co-operated in proving what men were predisposed to believe, were admitted without suspicion or critical examination.

OXFORD ENGLISH PRIZE ESSAY, FOR 1822.

THE STUDY OF MORAL EVIDENCE.

Fidei dentur quæ fidei sunt.—Dr AUGMENTIS

THE attainment of truth is, or ought to be, the great object of our intellectual pursuits, which are important only as they fit us to discharge with propriety the parts we are severally called to act. But as we are very liable to be deceived, this attainment involves an investigation into the tests by which we may discriminate between truth and error, and learn to recognise the one while we reject the other: in other words, it involves an inquiry into the nature of evidence in general, and the peculiarities which distinguish the different forms of proof which the human mind is capable of receiving.

All evidence may be reduced into the two great classes of demonstrative and moral. It is with the former exclusively that the mathematician is conversant, and his deductions are generally considered to possess the merit of absolute certainty; a claim which has not been conceded to the moral reasoner, whose arguments must all be derived from probabilities; and these, it is generally conceived, can never, by any possible accumulation, amount to such certainty as that which attends the study of demonstrative truth.

It is not indeed surprising, that demonstrative evidence should have received the preference of scientific men, who could not fail to admire the luminous precision of its language, the secure and elegant process of its reasoning, and the incontrovertible certainty of its results. Nothing can be more satisfactory, either to the sincere disciple of truth, or the indolent speculator, than to be conducted to complete conviction by an irresistible impulse which at once removes the danger of falling into a single fallacy, and precludes the necessity of ascertaining the relative value of contradictory arguments.

The manifest defect, however, of such reasoning is, that, though it may serve to carry on the abstract investigations of the philosopher, it is inapplicable to by far the greater part of our actual occupations. Whatever estimate, on the contrary, we may form of the credit due to moral evidence,

this at least is certain, that it is on probabilities alone that we build those conclusions which carry us through the practical detail of life.

The pure mathematics are extremely confined in their operation, and by themselves would be of no ultimate utility beyond the mere exercise of the reasoning powers; and we shall have occasion to observe hereafter, that even in this respect their advantage is limited and equivocal.

Though our knowledge, for instance, of the laws which regulate the physical phenomena of the universe can only be reduced to the precision of science by the application of mathematical proof, yet it is not by the cautious and short-sighted process of demonstration, that genius has been able to extend the boundaries of our knowledge by the discovery of those laws, and thus to introduce the mathematician to subjects of contemplation with which he must otherwise have remained for ever unacquainted. We view with just admiration the discoveries which Newton made of the laws which prevail throughout the boundless extent of space; but the basis of the lofty fabric he has reared is an assumption of which there is no proof but in analogy,—the lowest species of moral evidence. We observe that, as far as our experience reaches, when a body is impelled from an elevated station, it tends towards the earth with an uniformly accelerated velocity; but what certainty have we that the laws of gravity, which we cannot demonstrate to be universally applicable even to the earth we inhabit, have any existence whatever in regions so far removed from our observation? We find, indeed, that on these principles we can account for the motions of the heavenly bodies, and that, assuming gravity as a datum, all our subsequent calculations may be conducted with the utmost degree of mathematical precision. But this coincidence may, for any thing we can demonstrate to the contrary, be purely accidental, and have no more real connexion with those phenomena than that of a key with the lock which it happens to fit, but for which it was not originally designed.

All such assumptions, though founded on the most comprehensive induction, would be at once rejected as uncertain by the mere geometrician. But the “subtilty of nature,” in its turn, rejects his uncompromising precision, and will not exhibit its wonders but to the disciple of a more tolerant philosophy. Without the aid of moral reasoning, science must for ever be confined to the unprofitable office of evol-

ving the abstract relations of quantity, and even with its assistance can apply only to the grosser properties of the visible creation. When, however, we pursue our investigations into the composition and natural history of the earth on which we move, and attempt to explain the appearances it exhibits; when we examine the affinities of different substances with each other, or indulge in speculations respecting the phenomena which are constantly taking place around us, we must be content with such evidence as probability affords; for these subjects, in all their extensive and interesting detail, will not submit to strict demonstration.

Still more is this the case, when from the inanimate we turn to the sensitive part of the creation. No sooner do we arrive at the noblest and most comprehensive study to which our faculties can be directed, and make the mind of man the object of our research, than we are deserted entirely by demonstration. It is by moral evidence alone that the historian brings us acquainted with the times that are past, and that the divine supplies us with information respecting the future; it is by this that the orator hurries along our judgment to his own conclusions, that the poet charms us into wisdom, and the philosopher accounts for the influence of both. Though we may form a precise idea of a right line, as that which lies evenly between its extreme points, we cannot demonstrate what course of conduct duty may require or wisdom dictate; and he would be very far from possessing a sufficient moral rule, who might have been merely told that virtue is the mean between opposite vices. Whenever, in one word, we consider man as a reasonable and responsible agent, we argue on moral evidence, and find the mathematics not only inapplicable, but even unfriendly to our inquiries. It is the pride of that jealous science to exclude the influence of every part of our spiritual constitution which is not essential to the simple exercise of reason. With all the finer sensibilities of our nature, with our hopes and fears, our joys and griefs, our antipathies and predilections, the affections which bind us to each other, and the passions which modify or cement our intercourse, it holds no alliance, but rather rejects them as so many impediments to the attainment of truth. While, however, demonstration, entrenched within this narrow boundary, is incompetent to investigate the phenomena of mind, and unable to turn to any account our various mental energies, the

moral philosopher is restrained only by the limits of the intellectual universe, and avails himself of every modification of feeling and shade of character, considering them as subservient to his sublime investigations.

This association with sentiment, however, has frequently been urged, even by those who admit the extensive influence of moral evidence, as a prominent objection to its intrinsic worth. Accurate men have been forward to complain, that the understanding is too much under the influence of feeling, and we often find them expressing a hope that at some future period a language may be invented better adapted for philosophical purposes, and bearing some resemblance to the algebraical calculus.¹ The most obvious answer to such remarks is drawn from the necessity of the case. It certainly were to be wished that we could be in any degree emancipated from the tyranny which words exercise over our ideas, as well as from that of passion over our judgment. But even this, though it would give greater stability to moral reasoning, would not extend the department of strict demonstration; and as long as human nature is the same, we must expect that passion, under all its forms, will retain its power, though circumstances may limit its exercise. The line which marks the boundaries of mathematical precision must ever continue the same, and throughout the wide extent of unappropriated territory which lies beyond it, moral evidence will still remain as the only criterion of truth, and the only medium of investigation. Here we shall be exposed to the same imperfections which now retard our advancement in knowledge; we shall be often blinded by prejudice, misdirected by false feeling, bewildered among the unsubstantial creations of fancy, and cheated by the ingenious fallacies of sophistical declamation. But since "we can rule nature only by obedience," it is of great moment to ascertain by all possible means the laws according to which she proceeds. This is, however, the province of the moral reasoner, and it belongs to him exclusively. It is he alone who can penetrate the human breast, and sweep at will the chords of sympathy till they respond to every emotion he may be anxious to excite. Whether the imagination be imme-

¹ See the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, l. iv. c. 3. s. 16, l. iv. c. 12. s. 7. &c.

diately addressed by the fascinations of poetry and eloquence, or our judgment assailed under the more imposing form of logical precision, still demonstration, at least what is usually considered such, is absolutely excluded; the utmost we can assert of any evidence we bring forward on such subjects is, that it bears the marks of a greater or less degree of probability, and the sum of our proof can amount only to such conviction as must result from the aggregate influence of these probabilities on the mind.

Are we then to conclude that our real knowledge is confined to the properties of curves and angles, while in the vast field of interesting inquiry over which, as we have seen, moral evidence extends, we can only wander about in uncertainty, and indulge in plausible conjectures? Most assuredly, if scientific demonstration be the sole criterion of truth, we must acknowledge, however melancholy the concession would be, that we are ignorant of all that concerns our best and dearest interests. For since moral evidence comprises almost every subject about which our faculties can be engaged, from the most ordinary topics of common life to the highest mysteries of religion, the present discussion is not a merely speculative inquiry, but assumes a character of vast practical importance; the question involved in it being not simply, whether we will submit to have our intellectual estate wrested from us in consequence of some flaw in the title-deed, and the garniture of our mind stripped off by the wand of a magician, who would persuade us that all in which we gloried is void of substance; but whether we will consent to give up the only light which can guide, the only staff which can support us through the regions of infinity?

But is this the only alternative; and is it not possible, that moral evidence, at least in its most perfect form, may lead us to a species of certainty fully equivalent, in the conviction which it imparts, to mathematical demonstration, though differing from it in some important respects, and particularly in the process by which it is attained?

In the first place, what is the amount of that demonstrative certainty, as it is called, with which those who reject the authority of moral reasoning profess to be satisfied? Is the former so essentially superior to the latter as to be altogether free from exception, even when subjected to a minute analysis, on the strict, and, as we hope to prove, illegitimate principles of sceptical philosophers?

If, as has been generally supposed, the mathematics are founded on axioms which impart their own intrinsic evidence to all legitimate deductions from them, we may ask what proof can be afforded of these fundamental truths, beyond that which attends many maxims in physical and moral philosophy? Is it more indisputably certain, for instance, that the whole is greater than its part, than it is, that the same person cannot be in different places at the same moment? But it will be urged, that it is not the axioms, but the definitions, from which mathematical science is derived, and that it would be absurd to call in question the latter, since they are nothing more than the arbitrary conditions on which the geometrician founds his arguments. He asserts nothing respecting this or that trilateral figure, but merely that whenever three straight lines inclose a space, call it by what name you please, the internal angles formed by their mutual inclination will be equal to those formed on both sides of one straight line let fall upon another straight line. Let it then be granted, that these abstract and conditional assertions are of such a nature that it involves a contradiction in terms to dispute their truth: let it be further granted, that this is the case with every assertion through the whole course of a problem; and that the connexion between them is necessary and self-evident: still, strictly speaking, is there no possibility of error? In our advances from one step in the demonstration to another, must we not always trust, in some degree, to our recollection of preceding proofs, and are we not liable to inadvertence? We know that in arithmetic, one branch of the mathematics, mistakes of this nature are constantly committed, and not discovered even after several revisions. What proof is there, then, if actual proof be demanded, that similar mistakes may not, in other instances, affect the accuracy of our mathematical deductions? It is admitted that they are not in all cases strictly accurate:¹ for in fluxions we do not actually arrive at truth; we only approach nearer to it than by any assignable difference, and that, not by a direct and simple process, but by the result of two equal and opposite errors, which negative each other. Or, if we assume the hypothesis which has been more recently maintained, we must argue on the ulterior divisibility of magnitudes, which we had

¹ Thus, when proving that every equation has a root, it is necessary to infer the fourth case, by analytical analogy.

previously reduced to a nonentity. Such a course of reasoning is no doubt necessary when we would investigate the properties of infinites.; but what claim has the mathematician, who feels himself obliged by the nature of his subject to adopt such a course, to the exclusive merit of demonstrative precision?

We would not, however, be understood to make these remarks with any view of depreciating the authority of the mathematics. Every man who is capable of understanding them, is as firmly persuaded of their certainty as he is of his personal identity; but the latter is a moral truth, and may be adduced, among many others, as one, the evidence of which is as perfect as if it were derived from a series of demonstrations. The object of our remarks is simply to show that the demand of the sceptic is unreasonable, since he asks for a degree of proof of which our faculties are not susceptible. There is in reality no interval between truth and error; every fact exists or does not exist; every statement is correct or incorrect. The only cause of the different shades of belief, from bare conjecture to assurance, "is, that we are not able to receive the same degree of evidence on all subjects; and we are able to receive perfect evidence on none. "All knowledge," say the schoolmen, "must be received in the proportion of the recipient;" no finite vessel can be of infinite capacity; and however refined our speculations may be, they must always partake, more or less, of the imperfection of our reasoning powers.

Admitting, therefore, in the most explicit terms, that demonstrative evidence possesses the highest degree of theoretical certainty, let us, in the next place, inquire whether we are not practically capable of deriving as complete conviction from moral evidence. For conviction, as it is the object, must, after all, be the test of evidence; and we must acknowledge the sufficiency of that proof from which our nature is so constituted as to be unable to withhold her assent. This is the utmost power which demonstration itself can possess; and the question is, therefore, whether moral evidence be ever equally efficacious?

It cannot, we conceive, be denied, that this is sometimes the case; and that there are moral truths which obtrude themselves upon the mind,¹ and there exercise a dominion

¹ Bishop Horsley places these natural truths in the highest rank of certainty, and considers them as approaching, nearer than any other, to

over our belief which we are totally unable to explain, and yet we cannot emancipate ourselves from its influence by any formula of metaphysical incantation. But this is mortifying to the pride of reason, which is unwilling to believe any thing it cannot comprehend, or to admit any thing which it cannot prove. Of the extent to which this scepticism may be carried, we have a remarkable and well known instance in the meditations of Des Cartes, who, after having expelled from his mind all former opinions, proceeded to grant them readmittance with greater caution, and attempted to prove even his own existence by some ingenious, but, as it seems, not altogether conclusive arguments. They were, however, satisfactory to himself, and he imagined that it was on these arguments that his better informed belief of his existence depended. But we may venture to assert, that his assent on this occasion was entirely independent of any process of reasoning, and that nobody in his senses could have doubted it for a single instant, even should it be opposed by the full weight of mathematical demonstration. We believe, indeed, more than this, on similar grounds; and are equally certain that other reasonable beings exist besides ourselves; and further, that the same objects suggest to them the same ideas; in short, that they reason precisely in the same manner as we do. Although we have nothing but moral evidence for this fact, we cannot avoid believing it, and constantly act upon it, notwithstanding the many obvious exceptions which may be made to its universal truth.

The same remark will apply to our belief in the independent existence of matter. We are conscious, indeed, of certain sensations; but if we choose to question the report of our senses, there is, perhaps, no possibility of deciding whether these sensations are the signs of any external objects, or whether our soul is, in this respect, merely

those which are the subjects of Divine intelligence. "To that Great Being who knows things, not by testimony—not by sense, but by their causes, as being himself the first cause, the source of power and activity to all other causes—to Him every thing that ever shall be, is at all times infinitely more certain than any thing either past or present can be to any man, except perhaps the simple fact of his own existence, and some of those necessary truths which are evidenced to every man, not by his bodily sense, but by that internal perception which seems to be the first act of created intellect." SERMON xiv. p. 127.

holding converse with itself. An ingenious speculator has gone so far as to maintain that the existence of matter is impossible, and that the vulgar belief in it is absurd. But of all the refinements of philosophers, there is none so revolting to the common sense of mankind as this. We have a firm persuasion that what we see and feel has a real and palpable existence, and nothing can convince us to the contrary. Nor is this persuasion unphilosophical: we find it impressed on our minds by him who made us, and act wisely in placing implicit reliance on the consistency and veracity of our Divine Instructor.

Our belief in the relation of cause and effect rests on nearly similar grounds. We can give no reason why one circumstance should lead to another, and experience informs us only that particular events have always followed each other in a certain order. Yet on this evidence we have no doubt that whenever similar circumstances take place, they will be attended with the same results; in other words, that the former were the cause of the latter, and will always have the power of producing them.

We deposit grain in the earth with the assured expectation that it will appear again to reward our labors; we form, in short, every project of life on a belief in the uniformity of the course of nature: but what proof have we that the sun which rose yesterday will rise again to-morrow? much more that it will rise at a particular moment, or on one side of the horizon rather than on the other? Yet here again, in the absence of all that can strictly be called proof, we find ourselves impelled by the very constitution of our nature to believe, that what has been will be when the circumstances are the same. It is as if the Creator had, in compassion to our weakness, folded up in the infant soul certain principles of reasoning, to grow with its growth, and be developed with the gradual expansion of its faculties. Such laws of belief, or by whatever name we may call the instinctive propensities alluded to, enter into the very essence of reason; and so far is the attempt to disclaim them from necessarily indicating any extraordinary compass of mind, that, on the contrary, it is the most certain token of the absence of that intellectual simplicity which, after all, is the surest guide to truth. The proof which is conveyed to the mind by this secret but efficacious process, we may, if permitted to assume a certain latitude of expression, venture to call *constitutional demonstration*; and it is, in all

truly important points, quite as satisfactory as that which attends the abstract sciences.

Even our belief in the existence of the Deity himself we must be content to rest on the same basis. We find it necessary to search for some Being who shall be the source of life and reason, the prototype of our ideas of the fair and good, the object of our best affections, the consummation of our most exalted hopes, and the original cause of whatever exists within and without us. There may be many circumstances which we cannot comprehend attending the existence of a Being endowed with infinite attributes, and there may be many specious arguments to stagger our belief. When, however, we take all this into our calculation, it is still so much more probable that there should be One who was from everlasting, and who is infinite in power, in wisdom, and in goodness, than that the world should have been formed by a fortuitous concurrence of atoms, or mind produced by some subtile organization of matter, that our belief of this fundamental truth is at least as firm as that which we entertain of any mathematical proposition whatever. But our conviction in this instance is in a great measure the result of circumstances, which, by the confirmation they lend each other, amount to a form of evidence so manifestly conclusive, that we need not hesitate to designate it by the term of *circumstantial demonstration*.

The existence of an intelligent Creator is, indeed, a strong case in this class of evidence; but the same mode of reasoning which is fatal to an atomical theory of the universe, is also applicable to many subordinate truths. Let us consider it in relation to our belief of facts which have not fallen under our personal notice. We are told that the credibility of any fact is lessened, not in a simple, but in a compound ratio, according to the number of hands through which an account of it has been transmitted. If this remark be applied to oral tradition, and that confined to a single channel, we must admit its accuracy. There may, however, be such a uniform coincidence of unconnected traditions on some particular point, as to remove the possibility of a doubt respecting it: because the very same reasons which invalidate the testimony of a single chain of tradition, corroborate with increased force that of several such chains, all concurring, without any essential deviation, in the same statement. If, for instance, the knowledge of some important event had been confined to a particular

district, and had been constantly believed there, this evidence would be entitled to some consideration. But should it appear that a belief in the same event formed part of the creed of a vast number of districts between which there had not existed for many ages any communication, we should be obliged to fall in with the universal persuasion that such an event had really taken place.

Here, however, we are going on the supposition of a merely oral tradition: but should contemporary written documents coincide in their relation of some event, the evidence resulting from their coincidence would rise still higher in the scale—it would, in fact, rise to demonstration: for what mathematicians teach us respecting chances is sufficient to prove, that there may be such an extensive and uniform coincidence as shall be absolutely conclusive respecting the statement it may be brought forward to support. If all we knew of the invasion of Italy by Annibal were contained in the writings of Livy, we should indeed be justified in rejecting many particulars of the interesting and poetical account which he has given us, and yet it would be most unreasonable to discredit the main facts of his history. When, however, we find these facts related by many other original historians, forming topics for the declamations of orators, and still further confirmed by the incidental allusions of poets, we are compelled to acknowledge in this mass of evidence a coincidence which it would be in the last degree absurd to attribute to a merely casual concurrence; it would in reality be quite as unreasonable as to deny that the square of the hypotenuse is equal to the squares of the two other sides. This is, however, all for which we contend; namely, that moral evidence is sometimes equal in the certainty which it communicates, to scientific demonstration itself.

Sometimes, indeed, this is not the case, and we are under the necessity of receiving a less distinct and palpable proof on a vast number of the most interesting subjects. But if we do actually receive it, if we have moral evidence only for all our knowledge respecting the physical constitution of the universe, and yet frame systems of natural philosophy; if we cannot apply even our mathematical speculations to any practical purposes without its assistance, and yet rank mechanics and astronomy among the sciences; if it is on this ground that we credit the best authenticated statement; that we form our projects and regulate our daily conduct;

we may, surely, ask with confidence, why Religion is to be the only subject in which this form of reasoning shall be considered as inconclusive? On all other matters of discussion, mathematics alone excepted, we are obliged to act as the balance of contending probabilities may determine us, and yet act certainly and without hesitation. Why then are we to look for more direct proof on that subject which is removed the furthest from our immediate experience? Particularly when the moral evidence on which Revelation rests, arising from the transcript which it exhibits of the Divine Mind, its consistency with itself, its applicability to the wants of man, the practical effects it has produced, and, lastly, the coincident testimony by which it is supported, is as ample as could reasonably be expected, and is considerably greater than that on which we are on many occasions compelled to act. We acknowledge, indeed, that it is not essentially different, and that the claim of the Bible to be received as of Divine authority must be vindicated by the same species of reasoning as that by which we would prove any other matter of fact. We admit also that the evidences of Christianity are not such as to force our belief as soon as they are presented to the mind; and we think we perceive wise reasons why it should be so. Truth compels us to admit thus much, and we do not shrink from the admission. It is difficult to say whether the cause of Revelation has suffered more from the licentiousness of sceptical inquiry, or from the arrogant pertinacity of dogmatical assertion. It is more honest, and it is more safe, to acknowledge at once the difficulties that must be encountered, and to direct the candid and humble investigator not to look for demonstration where such evidence is not to be obtained, but submit to what there is sufficient reason to believe bears the stamp of heaven, and restrain that hardihood of speculation which is apt to tread with an unhallowed foot on ground which does not lie within the precincts of human knowledge.

By far the most frequent cause of religious scepticism is an exaggerated estimate of our mental powers; and philosophy cannot confer a greater benefit on mankind than that of teaching us what are, and what are not profitable and legitimate subjects of inquiry, and what is the degree and species of evidence which the different sciences require.¹

¹ Vid. *Ethic. Nicomach.* l. . c. 3. *The Essay on Human Understanding*, vol. 1. p. 4.

This very desirable end has been in part attained by defining the precise character of that form of proof which belongs to the abstract sciences ; and the distinct classification of all evidence into demonstrative and moral has suggested logical canons of considerable importance. The case of demonstration is naturally a simple one, and is soon disposed of ; but moral evidence is of a more complicated and mysterious nature. Though much has been done, the obscurity which surrounds this subject does not appear even yet to have been altogether removed, and we may look for further elucidations as long as the human understanding continues to supply matter for philosophical discussion.

In the mean time, it is something to know the essential difference which exists between the two great classes of evidence ; and under what circumstances each may command our assent. This advantage has not, however, been gained without some accompanying evil, arising chiefly from the use of the terms *certain*, *demonstrative*, and *probable*, in a more restricted sense than that in which they are received in ordinary discourse. We commonly say that a course of reasoning has demonstrated some proposition, and it is only when the arguments brought forward are not quite satisfactory that we consider the conclusion as amounting to no more than simple probability. But when we hold this language it should always be remembered, that we express rather the degree of our conviction, than the nature of the evidence by which it was produced. When, on the other hand, we adopt the phraseology of philosophers, confining demonstration to the mathematics, and extending the epithet *probable* to many opinions of which we entertain no manner of doubt, we must not be understood to question the indisputable certainty of the latter, but merely to distinguish between the relative character of the two forms under which truth has been presented to our mind.

But in whatever terms we may think fit to convey our ideas, it is hoped that what has been advanced in the course of the present dissertation may tend to establish the position, that there are cases in which moral evidence is as complete in its kind as that supplied by mathematics, though it comes into the understanding, as it were, by a different road, and is attended with many important peculiarities. We have attempted to explain in what those peculiarities consist ; but if we were obliged to fix on one which more than any other marks with a strong line the essential distinction

between moral and demonstrative reasoning, it would be, that while the latter rejects every thing short of absolute proof, the former admits of successive degrees from the lowest possibility to complete and absolute assurance. It is chiefly on this ground of its occasional imperfection that the study of moral evidence has been underrated by accurate men; but perhaps, on a little consideration, it will appear to derive its practical superiority, as a means of mental discipline, from the very same cause which constitutes its theoretical defect.

The object of education is to impart to the mind a ready and accurate perception of truth, not only in our abstract speculations, but also in the actual conduct of life. Now we have seen that the truths about which we are conversant are by no means uniform in their composition, nor have they all the same commanding influence over our assent. Some are the result of principles, each of which is capable of absolute demonstration; others are the sum of arguments, none of them possessing intrinsic certainty, but yet contributing, by their mutual reflection, to make up a species of cumulative evidence which includes every shade of belief, sometimes leaving the mind in suspense, and sometimes producing positive conviction. If, on the one hand, it is certain that there is no fact, however wonderful, which may not be accredited by testimony, and no theory, however paradoxical, which may not be decked out with at least the semblance of truth, it is equally certain, that there is no fact or proposition so clear and even self-evident, as to be altogether proof against the cavils of scepticism. Here, then, lie the strength and weakness of moral evidence, its merit and its effect. As a medium of investigation, in some instances, indeed, it is perfect, because it produces full conviction; but in most instances it is imperfect. In the latter, however, it is the best we have; and we must therefore be satisfied with it, or remain in ignorance. And not only so, but its imperfection is suited to the condition of our nature; and if moral evidence does not supersede the exercise of judgment, by presenting to our understanding the full splendour of demonstrative certainty, it at least, by that very exercise of judgment, gives us a wholesome and quicksighted sensibility to the minor degrees of proof, and makes us better able to walk by those lesser lights which shine upon the obscurity of our path.

The study of the mathematics is attended with many

advantages; particularly as it communicates a habit of close and patient attention, giving precision to our ideas whilst it strengthens the memory. These are, no doubt, valuable attainments; but they may be purchased at too dear a rate; and we certainly shall have no reason to congratulate ourselves on their acquisition, if, while engaged in their pursuit, we should have impaired the vigor of other faculties which we are much more concerned to cultivate.

The student of abstract and naked truth too often hesitates where he ought to determine; but the man who has taken a long and comprehensive view of human nature, and exercised his mind by the contemplation of probabilities, avails himself of such evidence as lies before him, and learns to act while the other deliberates. Not that it will be the invariable consequence of the study of the mathematics to incapacitate a man for every other pursuit: many illustrious names might be quoted to contradict so rash an assertion. We are well aware, indeed, that the mixed mathematics demand a considerable exercise of moral reasoning, and have been at some pains to show that without it geometry would be entirely useless. Still, however, it can scarcely be controverted, that a pursuit, in which demonstrative evidence preponderates, is not the most favorable to the general cultivation of the mind; and that the exclusive study of demonstration is attended with effects which are often prejudicial.¹ Demonstration tyrannises over the will; it does not admit us to sit in judgment on its oracular decisions, but merely invites us to comprehend and receive them. Moral evidence does both: it encourages freedom of thought, and obliges us to discriminate, to reason, and to judge.

But the master faculty of the human mind is judgment—that quick *tact* which enables a man, when surrounded by a maze of conflicting probabilities, to seize upon that which

¹ "It may seem perhaps too much a paradox to say, that long habit in this science incapacitates the mind for reasoning at large, and especially in the search of moral truth. And yet I believe nothing is more certain." "I might appeal for the truth of this, to those wonderful conclusions which geometers, when condescending to write on history, ethics, or theology, have made from their premises. But the thing is notorious, and it is now no secret that the oldest mathematician in England (Whiston) is the worst reasoner in it, &c." *Julian, Bishop Warburton's Works*, vol. iv. p. 346. 4to.

approaches the nearest to truth. It is judgment which governs genius, directs talent, and is the seat of intellectual power. It is this which must make a man, instead of being the passive and ignorant receptacle of the knowledge of his forefathers, the intelligent instructor of future ages. Judgment is the principal ingredient in what we call force of character, and confers that fertility of resource, that decision and firmness of resolve, which, more than any other qualities, fit a man for active life.

How then are we to educate judgment? How are we to form the mind, which in the calculations of political expediency, or the arrangements of private life, would possess the power of pushing on one side whatever is irrelevant, of striking out whatever is counterbalanced by other circumstances of equal weight, and thus ascertaining to which side the scale inclines?

Nature seems to suggest some hints on this subject, by having made her most valuable gifts difficult of access, for the very purpose, no doubt, of stimulating ingenuity and rewarding perseverance. We must imitate nature in this method of instruction; and if we would invigorate the active powers, must not trust solely, nor even principally, to the almost mechanical routine of demonstrative reasoning, in which we recognise truth rather than discover it, and are taught to receive nothing as evidence which admits the possibility of a doubt. We must apply to those studies in which truth is often blended with error, and sometimes is so intimately blended, that the most delicate and experienced hand cannot reduce it to absolute purity. Here it is that judgment is called for. A mere theorist might wait until the dross were entirely removed: a practical man takes the metal in the best state in which he can procure it, and turns it to his purpose.

These remarks may be yet further illustrated by the description which Lord Clarendon has transmitted to us of the Earl of Leicester; who, we are told, "was very conversant in books, and much addicted to the mathematics; but though he had seen service, was a speculative rather than a practical man, and expected greater certitude in the consultation of business than the business of this world is capable of." And such are the natural consequences of similar pursuits. But what a striking contrast does the historian himself exhibit to this impracticable refinement. His masculine and nervous eloquence proceeds from an

open and energetic mind; not cramped by partial studies, nor fettered by abstract speculations, but informed by various knowledge, and disciplined among the contingencies of real life. Lord Clarendon had studied man under every aspect, and hence acquired not only a remarkable insight into character, but also that sound sense which might have saved his country, had he fallen on days less desperately evil, and not been thwarted by the perverse counsels of those with whom he was obliged to act.

But while we claim for the study of moral evidence the merit of overcoming that timid hesitation which destroys all freedom of thought and energy of action, we are by no means prepared to concede that it encourages a precipitancy of judgment, or an incautious facility of belief. On the contrary, nothing is more common than to hear those subjects which depend on probability, in the large sense in which we have used that term, charged with a tendency to induce the opposite defect of sceptical suspence. History, we are informed, only exposes the inaccuracy of testimony; and amidst all the inconsistent absurdities of those writers who have treated of the human mind, one point only is ascertained by common assent, namely, that our faculties are weak, and our knowledge uncertain.

Are we then to suppose, that the direct proof which attends demonstrative reasoning, and the indirect proof which is afforded to the intellectual philosopher, both lead by a different path to the same unhappy termination? Or may we not rather adopt the more probable alternative, that men have in this instance, as in many others, thrown the defect of their own mind on circumstances which they conceived to be independent of themselves? We are justified

¹ It is instructive to compare the sentiments which have been expressed on this subject by individuals whose characters differed so widely as those of Mr. Gibbon, Mr. Hume, and Bishop Watson.

"As soon as I understood the principles, I relinquished for ever the pursuit of the mathematics; nor can I lament that I desisted before my mind was hardened by the habit of rigid demonstration, so destructive of the finer feelings of moral evidence, which must, however, determine the actions and opinions of our lives." *Life of Gibbon*, 4to. p. 66.

"The intense view of these manifold contradictions and imperfections in human reason, has so wrought upon me, and heated my brain, that I am ready to reject all belief and reasoning, and can look upon no opinion even as more probable or likely than another." *A Letter of Hume's quoted in D. Stewart's Life of Reid*, 4to. p. 439

"I was early in life accustomed to metaphysical discussion, and the

on the highest authority in asserting, that there is an intimate connection between moral and intellectual perversity;¹ and without any uncharitable insinuation against sceptical writers of either class, we may venture to remark, that whatever habits blunt the moral feelings have a proportionate tendency to make the mind less susceptible of truth.

Scepticism is not natural to us, but is induced by the character of our subsequent pursuits; for the constitution of our nature leads us to believe; and before experience and education have, in some measure, restrained this instinctive propensity, we invariably believe too much. Until the rules of sound reasoning are understood, the unpractised mind catches at the most remote connexion between events, joining them together as cause and effect; and it is to this source we must refer those popular superstitions which form an interesting chapter in the history of the human race, and retire slowly as the light of philosophy advances. The great danger then is not on the side of credulity, but lest truth should burst on the mind, like a tropical sun, in the full blaze of meridian glory, and dazzle him who is not prepared to behold its brightness. The progress of knowledge is attended with some inconveniences, which should be accompanied with their appropriate corrective. Nothing, however, will prevent the mind which has habitually rested its opinions on a sandy foundation, from the melancholy consequences which might follow when that foundation is washed away, but the inculcation of more accurate ideas respecting the character and comparative value of the evidence which attends the different departments of knowledge. What has been admitted without thought or discrimination, is relinquished with indifference; and that belief which is founded on slight grounds will be easily overturned by sophistry, and will yield more often to the latest impression, than to that which ought to have had the greatest and most abiding influence. The very same ignorance of the laws of evidence which, under some circumstances, gives rise to superstition, would, under a change of circumstances, ex-

certainty attending it; and not meeting with that certainty in the sciences of metaphysics, of natural and revealed religion, I have an habitual tendency to hesitation, rather than to a peremptory judgment on many points." *Life of Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff.*

¹ St. John vii. 17. &c.

pose the mind to infidelity; and it has frequently been observed, that the transition from one to the other is by no means an unusual occurrence. The fault of the vulgar is that of a too ready and undistinguishing admission of whatever has the appearance of proof; the partially educated err, on the other hand, by rejecting the highest evidence which the subject admits, and which ought therefore to be satisfactory and conclusive; nor is the credulity of the one more unreasonable than the scepticism of the other. The former does not reflect at all; the latter carries his precision beyond what his own constitution and the actual course of nature allow: but both these are the errors of an unsound mind, and can alone be removed by discipline. In the one case, therefore, we are obliged to provide a check to the hasty conclusions of the inconsiderate; in the other, we are called upon to arm the victim of sophistry with an honest confidence in the reality of human knowledge, and the worth of that conviction which is derived from the calculation of probabilities. This is the object, and this, if what has been advanced be just, will be the effect of the study of moral evidence.

Here then we close our remarks; not without a hope that they may suggest considerations of some practical importance.

What is truth? is the most interesting question we can be called upon to answer, and our reply will be shaped according to the ideas we entertain on the subject of the present inquiry. There are philosophers who would inform us that truth has no existence, and is a mere creation of our deluded fancy; there are others who would confine it within the pale of demonstration; and men of more imagination than judgment would throw open the barrier to the admission of much that is unworthy of so fair a title. But the legitimate study of moral evidence will convince us that all these answers would be defective. We have seen, that although demonstration is the most perfect form of proof, and the only convenient instrument of abstract reasoning respecting the external properties of matter, it is unable to supply us with any further information; but that we may, nevertheless, obtain real knowledge without its assistance. We have noticed some instances in which this is the case; that is to say, where moral evidence either communicates complete conviction to the mind through the mysterious agency of those intellectual perceptions which form the

basis of reason, or bears down all objection by the irresistible weight of concurring probabilities. But even in its less perfect state, such evidence ought, as we observed, to satisfy an ingenuous mind; for it is indisputable that our faculties are constituted to receive proof of this description, and to act upon it with an unhesitating conviction, which subsequent experience proves to have been well founded.

Since, however, a large proportion of the truths with which we are conversant are not unmixed with error, it is necessary to prepare the mind to analyse their qualities, and subject them to the proper tests. The delicate perception of truth and error which this operation requires, must be attained by exercise; and we observed, that the best field for such exercise is not demonstration, where there is no room for judgment; but that if we would arm the mind against every species of infirmity, we must have recourse to the ample stores of various knowledge to which moral evidence supplies the only key, and must therefore afford free access to truth at every inlet. Even those parts of our moral constitution which are considered to be most *adverse* to the dispassionate investigation of truth must be enlisted into the service; and not only our confirmed propensities, but our instinctive feelings also, should be turned to account, since, though they may differ from reason in their nature, they will, in the judgment of the sound philosopher, be often considered as equivalent to it. They were, undoubtedly, given for wise ends, and it should therefore be our object, not to eradicate, but to direct them; for it is forming a vulgar and very inadequate idea of the human mind to suppose it a mere vehicle of reason, which would be perfect in proportion as there should be less room left for the play of the passions. It is an instrument of far more curious and elaborate design, and none of its faculties can be neglected, or even drawn forth by a premature and ill-judged excitement, without imminent danger to the vigorous operation of all the rest. Demonstrative reasoning, if carried to excess, would chill the mind, and destroy its elasticity; poetry might give too decided an ascendancy to the imagination; without habits of cautious suspense we should not be able to sever truth from exaggeration and falsehood; too rigorous precision would prevent us from forming any general conclusions from what we read, or making any profitable application of our knowledge; without

some susceptibility of feeling, we should be incompetent to investigate the operations of the human understanding, and with too much feeling we should be apt to form vague and enthusiastic deductions. It should therefore be the object of an enlightened system of education, not so much to strengthen this or that particular faculty, as to provide for the steady and simultaneous development of them all.

For these reasons, even were the study of demonstrative evidence that which is best calculated to impart the necessary degree of expansion and energy to our reasoning powers, (which is, we conceive, far from being the case,) still very important objections would lie against an over partial attention to it. Objections equally important, though of a different nature, may no doubt be brought against the opposite system, which sets the youthful mind adrift in the search after truth, among the deep mysteries of intellectual philosophy, before reflection has furnished a competent number of facts to check the visions of audacious theorists, and before the understanding has acquired sufficient stability to be master of its own convictions. But we may pronounce that institution to approach nearest to perfection which tempers the study of moral with that of demonstrative truth; and thus, while guarding against the evils incident to an excessive cultivation of either, combines the advantages connected with both, and develops to their utmost every latent faculty of our intellectual nature.

WALTER AUGUSTUS SHIRLEY, A. B.

FELLOW OF NEW COLLEGE.

CAMBRIDGE ENGLISH PRIZE POEM FOR 1822.

PALMYRA.

*Movemur, nescio quo pacto, ipsis locis, in quibus eorum, quos admiramur, adsunt
vestigia.*

TIME, like a mighty river, deep and strong,
In sullen silence rolls his tide along;
And all that now upborne upon the wave
Ride swiftly on—the monarch and the slave,

Shall sink at last beneath the whelming stream,
And all that once was life become a dream !

Go—look on Greece ! her glories long have fled,
Her ancient spirit slumbers with the dead ;
Deaf to the call of freedom and of fame,
Her sons are Greeks in nothing but the name !
On Tiber's banks, beneath their native sky,
The sad remains of Roman greatness lie ;
No longer there the list'ning crowds admire
The swelling tones of Virgil's epic lyre,
Nor conq'ring Cæsar holds resistless sway
O'er realms extended to the rising day.

Yet still to these shall fancy fondly turn,
Still bid the laurel bloom on Maro's urn ;
From Brutus' dagger sweep the gath'ring rust,
And call his spirit from its aged dust !
What, though each busy scene has ceased to live,
It has the charms poetic numbers give ;
And ever fresh, as ages roll along,
Revives and brightens in the light of song.

At summer-eve, when ev'ry sound is still,
And day-light fades upon the western hill,
And o'er the blue unfathomable way
Heaven's starry host in cloudless beauty stray ;
What holy joys enamour'd fancy feels
As all the past upon the mem'ry steals !
How soft the tints, how pensive, how sublime,
Each image borrows from the touch of Time !
Such winning grace the beauteous image wears,
Seen through the twilight of a thousand years.

Then welcome thou, the subject of my song,
Since to the past such heavenly charms belong ;
Won by thy scenes, from all that now appears
My Muse shall turn, and dream of other years,
Turn from the sad realities of fate,
The past revive, the present uncreate,
And from thy modern learn thine ancient state.

What boundless charms thy lovely features grace,
O thou, the mother of the human race,
Majestic Asia ! to the straining eye
Ten thousand prospects far extended lie ;
Thine ample plains with varied beauty please,
Once the bright seats of opulence and ease ;
Thy mountain-heights with striking grandeur rise,
Veil'd in dark clouds, or lost in amber skies,

While bursting floods from thund'ring caverns pour
 Their foaming tides, with loud and angry roar;
 Then, lost in distance, lave the sunny plains
 Where beauty smiles, and peaceful pleasure reigns.

Full in the centre, tow'ring through the storm,
 See cloudy 'Taurus lift his rugged form,
 Monarch of mountains! Nature's awful throne,
 Where grandeur frowns in terrors all his own;
 Deep-rooted there, unnumber'd cedars throw
 Their giant shadows on the plains below;
 There, loudly gushing from the mountain's side,
 Euphrates rolls his dark and rapid tide,
 Then far beneath glides silently away,
 Through groves of palm and champaigns ever gay.

But as these scenes of sunny, calm delight
 Recede at length, and vanish from the sight,
 What barren solitudes of scorching sand
 Deform and desolate the fainting land!
 No fresh'ning breeze revives the lifeless air,
 No living waters sweetly murmur there,
 Dry fevers kindle pestilential fires,—
 All nature droops, and wither'd life expires!

But deep embosom'd in that sandy plain,
 Like distant isles emerging from the main,
 A radiant spot, with loveliest beauty crown'd,
 Once bloom'd in contrast with the scenes around,
 By Nature's lavish hand profusely graced,
 The blessed Eden of the joyless waste.
 On ev'ry side luxuriant palm-trees grew,
 And hence its name the rising city drew,
 And though their loveliness be pass'd away,
 The name still lives, and triumphs o'er decay.
 Two shel'ring hills precipitously swell
 On either hand, and form a narrow dell:
 Thence to the east, with undulating bend,
 Wide and more wide their spreading arms extend,
 Then sink at last with slow-retiring sweep,
 Like distant head-lands sloping to the deep.

Outstretch'd within upon the silent plains
 Lies the sad wreck of Tadmor's last remains,
 Outliving still, through each succeeding age,
 The tempest's fury, and the bigot's rage.
 He wants no written record who surveys
 But one short hour this scene of other days.

These mould'ring piles, that sink in slow decay,
In stronger characters the tale convey,
Than e'er were traced by man's divinest art,—
These speak in simple language to the heart.

Far to the south what scenes of ruin lie,
What sad confusion opens on the eye!
There shatter'd columns swell, a giant train,
Line after line, along the crowded plain,
The loosen'd arch, the roofless colonnade,
Where mid-day crowds imbibed the cooling shade.

'Tis sweet at eve to climb some rocky steep,
Around whose base the peaceful billows sleep,
And view a summer's sun sink down to rest,
Behind the mountains of the gorgeous west,
One maze of dazzling glory; while below
The ocean-waves with trembling radiance glow.
But sweeter far, at evening's solemn hour,
From the dun battlements of yon rude tow'r,
To see his parting splendors sadly blaze
Around this grave of long-forgotten days.
Mark those bright beams! how mournfully they shine
Through the still courts of yon deserted shrine,
The sun's proud temple once, whose aged piles
Still fondly catch his first and latest smiles!

Here Desolation cease—thy task is done—
Palmyra yields—thy triumph is begun.
O'er prostrate sculpture raise thy giant throne,
Build here at length an empire all thine own.
Swept by the might of thy destroying arm,
Her noblest work is reft of every charm,
Save that alone whose transitory gleam
Gilds the soft scenes of Fancy's pictured dream.

At her command, from dark oblivion's gloom
Past scenes return, and brighter shapes assume;
Things that have ceased to be she moulds anew,
And pours her own creation on the view;
In rapid train her fleeting visions rise,
As lights that gleam in Hyperborean skies,
E'en as she dwells on this deserted fane,
Its pomp revives, its glories live again;
The victim bleeds, the golden altars blaze,
Symphonious voices swell the note of praise;
Hark! what loud tumult rends the echoing skies?
“Awake—awake, lead up the sacrifice;

The hour is come—the dim nocturnal fires
Are fading in the blue—lo, night expires !
The morning star, with pale and dewy ray,
Proclaims the triumph of the King of Day.
Awake—awake—ye slumb'ring crowds; arise,
Come forth, and join the pomp of sacrifice "

And lo, he comes ! triumphant in his might,
One blazing orb of unexhausted light.
Ten thousand glories all around him wait,
His ever-flaming ministers of state ;
Ten thousand nations hail him with delight,
Bathed in the golden tide of ever-flowing light.
Hark ! as he rises o'er the middle way,
Throned in the fulness of unclouded day,
What sounds of joy, what echoing clamors rise,
Peal after peal, and rattle in the skies !
" Give way, ye crowds—unbar the gates of brass—
Give way, ye crowds, and let the triumph pass."
So when around some bold and rocky shore,
Old Ocean beats with unrelenting roar ;
Onward and onward roll the length'ning waves,
Then, swelling, dash upon the yawning caves,
Far, far away, the cavern'd cliffs resound,
And mountain-echoes thunder back the sound.
The day moves on ;—as ev'ning shades advance,
Some weave the song, while others lead the dance ;
From hill and vale resounding through the sky,
Breaks the full chorus of harmonious joy.
Those thrilling notes ! they seem to linger still—
Then sweetly die away o'er yon deserted hill.

It could not be ! those accents long have fled,—
Joy, feeling, language, dwell not with the dead.
Here, undisturb'd, upon the voiceless plains
The long, dull calm of desolation reigns.
Here ruin builds her adamantine throne,
And silence slumbers on each mould'ring stone.
Where once the hum of thronging nations rose,
No sound disturbs the solemn deep repose,
Save the lone Arab, idly passing by,
With reckless soul and unregarding eye ;
Save when at intervals some falling block
Sinks on the plain with harsh-resounding shock,
The slumb'ring desert drinks the hollow sound,
And startled echoes answer all around.

Is this the scene, so desolate and wild,
Where noblest arts in bright perfection smil'd !
Where Commerce emptied all her richest stores,
The nameless treasures of a thousand shores ?
Is this the scene where Freedom's purg'd flame
Led toiling nations in the path of fame ?
Their strife has ceas'd, their noise has died away,
Their very tombs are sinking in decay :
The sculptur'd monument, the marble bust,
Descend and mingle with their native dust ;
No half-disfigur'd line remains to tell
How much lamented merit liv'd and fell.

Once lovely scene ! along thy mould'ring piles
Tho' ruin frowns, yet beauty sadly smiles ;
Some rays of former glory linger yet
In twilight radiance, tho' thy sun is set.
But say, O say, who rightly may disclose
From what first cause thine infant greatness rose ;
Who first began, by what contrivance plac'd,
These splendid piles amid a desert waste ?

One little stream,—around whose bubbling head
Umbrageous palms refreshing coolness shed,
First gave the cause from which their glory came,
Palmira's strength, magnificence, and fame.
A thousand tribes, by distant commerce led,
Soon pour'd their treasures round that fountain-head ;
Pass'd and repass'd through all the sandy plain,
From broad Euphrates to the western main,—
The rising mart to strength and splendor came,
Tho' small at first, and grew a mighty name.
Thence o'er the Roman world, with swelling sail,
Proud commerce sprung before the fresh'ning gale,
And Tyrian ships to ev'ry port convey'd
The boundless treasures of Assyrian trade,
E'en Rome herself, at sight of Eastern gold,
Forgot the lessons taught her sons of old ;
Plung'd in the gulph of ostentatious pride,
She deeply drank th' intoxicating tide ;
Through ev'ry nerve the vital poison ran,
And Goths achiev'd what luxury began.

Thou Eden of the desert ! lovely smil'd
Thy matchless beauty o'er the lonely wild ;
'Mid barren solitudes securely plac'd,
Thy native bulwark the surrounding waste.

Tho' loud and harsh the tumult roar'd without
Of Rome triumphant and the Parthian rout,
Peace o'er thy plains her downy pinions spread,
And twin'd the olive for thy blooming head;
Taste, learning, genius, triumph'd in her reign,
And guardian Freedom bless'd the sister train.
Thrice glorious Freedom! on whose hallow'd shrine
Burns ever bright the patriot flame divine,
She, great preceptress, warm with heavenly fire,
Bade thy free sons to worthiest hopes aspire,
Live unsubdued, and equally disdain
To wear the victor's as the despot's chain.

Such were the souls that o'er the proud array
Of banner'd Persia scatter'd wild dismay.
Far in the East, with loud redoubled roll,
The tumult burst upon the tyrant's soul.
Confusion seiz'd his host, and pallid fright
Mark'd with disgrace his ignominious flight.

Then, lovely city, what rejoicings rose—
What songs of triumph from thy palmy groves—
What altars blaz'd—what clouds of incense roll'd
Their rich perfume around thy shrines of gold—
What bursts of rapture echoed from the throng,
As the proud triumph slowly moved along.

Such was thy glory once! a transient gleam
Of brightest sunshine—a delusive dream.
Most like the pageant of thy festal day,
It charm'd a little while; then pass'd away.
Or like those varying tints of living light
That gild at eve the portals of the night;
Alps pil'd on Alps, a glorious prospect rise,
Ten thousand phantoms skirt the glowing skies:
But as we gaze the splendid vision fades,
Lost in the gloom of night's obscurer shades.

O doom'd to fall! while yet indulgent fate
A few bright years prolongs thy fleeting date,
Thy name shall triumph, and thy laurels bloom.
Ere yet they languish in sepulchral gloom.
And as the breathless pause that oft portends
The rising tempest ere the storm descends,
Thus at the close shall glory's loveliest light
Gild the dark clouds of thine approaching night.
For tho' the beams of truth's historic page
But faintly gleam through each successive age,

Tho' her recording annals briefly tell
How Tadmor rose, by what disaster fell,
One name at least survives the wreck of time,
From age to age extends, from clime to clime.

Oh! if departed glory claims a tear, •
Let mem'ry pause, and kindly drop it here.
If fond reflection e'er loves to dwell
On those last scenes where royal greatness fell,
Thy reign, Zenobia, and thy deathless name,
Shall live emblazon'd on the roll of fame;
Adorn the poet's most romantic dream,
Fire all his soul, and be his moral theme.

At length drew nigh th' inexorable hour
Charg'd with the stroke of Rome's destroying pow'r;
In dread array along the Syrian coast
Mov'd the full strength of her invading host,
Wide o'er the champaign, like a baleful star,
Blaz'd the proud standard of imperial war;
Perch'd on the top, the bird of conquest shone,
With glittering wings expanded to the sun.

Yet all undaunted stood the warrior-queen,
Foremost and bravest in the battle-scene.
Quick at her word, fast binding man with man,
Through ev'ry rank electric vigor ran.
Not such the valor of the beautiful maid,
Whose conqu'ring steel proud Ilion's fate delay'd;
Not such in arms the virgin warriors shone,
Who drank thy waters, limpid Thermodon.
Fair idol of the virtuous and the brave,
Great were thine efforts—but they could not save.
Twice on the plain the dubious conflict burn'd,
Twice to the charge the struggling hosts return'd,
'Till at the close, where open valor fail'd,
Art won the day, and stratagem prevail'd.

Thus the proud seat of science and of arms,
In the full promise of her rip'ning charms,
Palmyra fell!—art, glory, freedom shed
Their dying splendors round her sinking head.

Where was Zenobia then?—what inward pow'r
Rul'd all her spirit in that awful hour?
Could Rome, fierce Rome, the fire of valor tame,
Shake the firm soul, or quench the patriot flame?
Say, when destruction, black'ning all the air,
Let loose the vulture-demons of despair,

When Rome and havock swept the sadd'ning plain,
 And Tadmor fell, when valor toil'd in vain,
 Did she not then the gath'ring tempest brave,
 And with her country share one common grave?
 Oh, sad reverse! what future fate besel
 The captive queen—let deepest silence tell.
 Ye who the faults of others mildly scan,
 Who know perfection was not made for man,
 In pity pause—O be not too severe,
 But o'er Zenobia's weakness drop a tear.
 Turn from the scene of her disastrous fate,
 The wrongs that mark'd her last embitter'd state,
 And see Longinus in his dying hour
 Spurn the fierce Roman, and defy his pow'r.
 In vain the tyrant roll'd his redd'ning eye,
 It aw'd not him who trembled not to die.
 To his sad friends he breath'd a last farewell,
 And Freedom triumph'd as her martyr fell.
 His daring soul, in death serenely great,
 Smil'd on the scene, and gloried in her fate,
 Spread her glad wings, and steer'd her flight sublime
 Beyond the storms of nature and of time.

J. H. BRIGHT
 ST. JOHN'S COLL.

CRISEOS MYTHOLOGICÆ SPECIMEN.

Explicantur causæ fabulæ de Æneæ in Italiam adventu.

CUM in omnibus disciplinis, quas mens humana excoluit, studium universæ doctrinæ principiis quibusdam quasi fundamentis superstruendæ atque ad certas regulas et canones disponendæ, quod studium nunc vocant systematicum, ninfio multos impetu et fervore abriperit; tum idem liberius grassatum esse atque grassari affirmare audeo in doctrina mythologica. Quot ingenia sese contulerunt ad mythos sive fabulas antiquorum populorum illustrandas; tot fere non de singulis quibusdam atque subtilioribus ejus doctrinæ quæstionibus, sed de summis, unde omnia pendere videntur, principiis inter se dissidentes et toto cœlo discrepantes sententiæ. Quondam opinioni, fabulas Græcas aliorumque populorum nihil esse nisi distractas atque distortas e operis sacris Judæorum notiones, stabiliendæ multum olei et opes insûmebatur: nunc ut ab Ægypto, Phœnicia, denique

ab India, quascunque fabulas Ἑλλὰς ἡ μυθοτόκος progeniit, derivent, non pauci sed unusquisque alia et diversa via omnes vires intendunt. Sed impeditior etiam quam de origine est quaestio de sensu, quem mythi pròdere videantur. Ecce alius systema astronomicum ex Ægyptiis Græcisque fabulis callide saue extricavit; alius cum Stoicorum secta ad physica dogmata illustranda deos et heroas esse inventos sibi persuasit; alius cum Euhemero et Ephoro meram historiam temporum antiquiorum a poetis in eam formam redactam esse sibi persuasissimum habet. Sed nobis non est propositum, has in diversa discurrentes rationes enumerare et persequi. Habent eæ omnes quibus se commendunt, et sæpe animum tuum specie quadam mirifica tantoperè fallunt, deliniunt, occupant, ut vix assensum cohibueris, donec te sæpius ita deceptum esse expertus fueris. Nimirum hæc illi tantum ante oculos tuos ponunt, quæ ipsorum placitis favere videntur; quæ discrepant, astuti subducere didicerunt. Neque fabulas tibi plenas exhibent, sed seligunt quæ ad doctrinam ipsorum ostentandam faciant. His turbis originem dare apparet nimium illud quod systematicum diximus studium. Huic igitur jam necesse est sese opponat et strenue cum eo colluctetur methodus critica, quæ res traditas nunquam ad opiniones præceptas adaptet et conformet, sed e traditis critice et dialectice examinatis sensum genuinum eliciat. Cujus methodi hæc puto esse præcepta, ut primum, quantum ex auctoritatibus scriptorum fieri licet, varias formas exhibeas, quas mythus quidam per plures Græcæ nationis ætates induerit, earumque antiquissimam et origini proximam indagare studio acerrimo allabores, præcipue ut poetarum ornamenta et delicias segreges a fama vetusta, quam poëtæ e populari narratione exceperunt; ut regionem Græciæ, cui mythus peculiaris sit, sacrum dei, unde pendeat, et quæcunque ad fabulam formandam vel mutandam facere potuerint, sedulo statuas et examines. Quæ si præstiteris, atque ita quasi historiam mythi delineaveris, propius certe te accessisse intelliges ad summam quaestionem solvendam. Cujus methodi ut specimen aliquod præstem, atque iudicibus *κρίτικαὶ τοῖς* approbare studeam, cum quid seligerem, auxilium ne ab incepto cadam, diu hæsitaverim, tandem selegi nobilem atque a classibus puerorum decantatam, sed explicatu valde difficilem, fabulam de Æneæ in Italiam adventu.¹

¹ Scriptores, quos eam tractasse novi, præter Cluverium et Ryckium et Heynii egregias ad Virgilium dissertationes, sunt, B. G. Niebuhr, operis critici de Historia Romana auctor, qui cum multa bonæ frugis ad originem fabulæ indagandam attulerit, in eo substitit, ut veterem esse in Italia famam decerneret. Contra quem A. G. Schlegel, elegantia de Niebuhrii opere censura auctor, inventum esse Græcæ adulætionis probare voluit Recentissimi de historia Romana operis auctor, Währenfuth, adventum Æneæ in Italiam historicum factum esse, quod vocat, contendit. Cui sententiæ

Fabula de Æneæ in Italiam adventu quam sit obscura jam hinc intelligi potest, quod ne id quidem apparet, utrum ab origine Græca fuerit an Romana. Quam quidem quæstionem ut inutilem rejicient ii, quibus persuasum est, Æneam, ducem Trojanum, revera venisse in Italiam, Turnum interfecisse, Laviniam uxorem duxisse. Adversus quos primum argumenta colligenda sunt. Ac principio concedamus, quanquam non admodum probabile existimamus, fieri potuisse, ut dux quidam Troja profugus Italiam versus vela dirigeret, aut si ventorum et undarum incerto motu ferebatur, ut cum ea sociorum turba, quæ auctoritatem ipsi et potentiam conciliaret, ad littus maris Tyrrheni salvus appelleret, quod seculis duobus vel tribus ante primam a Græcis ad mare inferum coloniam deductam seculis factum esse putant. Concedamus id, cum liberum sit cuique, Trojanis meliorem navium dirigendarum peritiam tribuere, quam Græcis. Sed equidem magis miror, memoriam colonie illius apud populos Italiæ indigenas, Etruscanque et Sabellam stirpem, per plura secula scribendi artis plane ignara ita servari potuisse memoriter, ut nomen et origo herois eadem agnosci potuerint, quæ inter Græcos Homerus celebraverat. Mirum id quidem, sed singulari quodam fato et id fieri poterat. At spectemus id ipsum, quod traditur, utrum magis oleat historiam an fabulam. Bene teneas, non id ab antiquioribus tradi, quod pueri e Virgilio et Livio didicerunt; Æneam regem fuisse Lavinii, hinc posteros ejus Albam Longam condidisse; unde denique Romanæ stirpis conditorem prodixisse. Nimirum nomina illa regum Albæ Sylviorum, crede mihi, tum demum valde pingui Musa inventa sunt, cum collata Romanorum et Græcorum chronologia ingens hiatus inter bellum Trojanum et Romam conditam perciperetur. Verum prisca fabula talium fallaciarum incuriosa ingenua simplicitate prodiderat Æneam Romuli vel patrem vel avum.¹ Hæc usque ad Sallustium² ab auctoribus Græcis et Romanis repetita, et postea demum, vel brevi tempore ante Sallustium, mutata sunt. Vides, quam se fabulam prodat ipsa fabula. Denique fabulam fictam esse, quæ de Roma ab Æneæ posteris condita narratur, docent collati Græci de Æneadarum fato mythi. Princeps locus est in Homero, qui Neptunum exhibet vaticinantem, Æneæ tum Achillis manibus ægre erepto ob pietatem erga deos constitutum esse post Priamidarum fata futurum in Trojanos regnum :³

haud dubie etiam suffragatus est Raoul-Rochette, cujus doctissimum de coloniis Græcis opus nunc non ad manus habeo. Alius contra scriptor Germanicus, Sickler, singulari dissertatione de Æneæ adventu scripta eam physico modo de eruptionibus montium ignivaporum e vocibus Hebraicis explicare tentavit.

¹ V. Niebuhrii Excursum de Romulo Æneæ nepote. *Annales pontificii* ap. Dionys. Hal. i. 73. p. 184. Reiske.

² Bell. Catilin. 6.

³ Iliad. xx. 307.

νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείας βίῃ Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει,
καὶ παῖδες παίδων, τοὶ καὶ μετόπισθε γένωνται.

Hæc sane verba seminis instar continere videntur omnem Æneidem. Sed quanquam postea etiam lectione mutata ad Romanorum imperium significandum adhibita sunt, tamen si accuratius ad ea attenderis et maxime animum ab aliis aliunde impressis notionibus exsolveris—quod plane necessarium est ad poëtas antiquiores recte intelligendos—jam non poteris non confiteri, hæc verba tantum referri posse ad regnum ab Æneadis in reliquias Trojani populi casui Ilii superstitis exercitum. Nihil enim de regno in Italos inuuitur, nihil de exilio, quod Neptūnus Æneæ non ut præmium pietatis polliceri, sed ut poenam omnium acerrimam minari, debuerat. Quid, quod heros misere extorris et in terra barbara ac plane tum ignota sedes nactus poëtæ omnino curæ esse non poterat, etiamsi fama quædam ejusmodi ex Italia nescio qua via transvecta esset? Sed docent ea verba quam apertissime: Homeri temporibus fuisse in vicinia prisci Ilii Trojanorum aliquam rempublicam ab Æneadarum gente regnatam;¹ quam tum Græcorum pacem et amicitiam coluisse libet conjicere; vix enim, puto, Homerus tantis laudibus extulisset Æneam, si stirps ejus Græcis adhuc esse infesta. Sedes hujus reipublicæ non erat vetus Ilium, quanquam et hoc an plane dirutum sit, adhuc ambiguum;² sed potius oppidulum quoddam in reductis Idæ vallibus, invidiæ et odio accolarum Æolensium minus obnoxium. Cui sententiæ magnopere favet Arctinus, qui in Æthiopicis nihil retulerat de Æneæ fati, nisi eum cum reliquiis Troicæ gentis ex incendio urbis in Idam montem aufugisse, et penates patrios secum abstulisse.³ Quid quod adhuc tempore belli Peloponnesiaci dynastarum quorundam hac eadem in regione mentio fit, Dardanorum de antiqua stirpe originem repetentium, quorum thesauri conditi erant Scepside et Gergithe, in castellis, vel oppidis bene munitis?⁴ Sed de Gergithe plura commemoranda sunt. Situm erat hoc oppidum e regione Dardani in agro Lampsaceno, sed montis Idæ jugis a mari quodammodo exclusum et sejunctum, atque stabat

¹ Quod affirmat Acusilaüs apud Scholia Iliad. xx. 307. cf. Strabo xiii. p. 608. c. Etiam fabulæ de Arisbe ab Ascanio Æneæ filio condita probant persuasionem Græcorum, Æneæ gentem non excessisse e Troadis confinio.

² V. Hellanicus et alii ap. Eustath. ad Il. p. 460. a. Rom. Cf. quæ ex eodem Dionys. Halic. i. 47. p. 119. Reiske. Contra Lycurg. in Leocr. p. 182. aliique Ilium plane vacuum et incolis orbatum fuisse tradunt, ex quo tempore Græci expugnauerant.

³ Vide excerpta e Chrestomathia Procli, et cf. Dionys. i. 68, 69. Contra Leaches, Iliadis minoris auctor, Æneam a Pyrrho abductum esse, tradiderat. • Schol. Lycophr. 1265.

⁴ Xenoph. Hell. 3, 1, 10.

usque ad Attali tempora, qui Gergithios expugnatos ad fontes Caici fluminis transtulit.¹ Hos Gergithios, Herodotus auctor est,² superstites esse ad sua usque tempora ex antiqua Teucrorum natione. Qui autem supererant de Trojanis, ut ex Homero vidimus, ex Æneadamum familia regulos habebant. Quid jam magis apertum, quam hoc ipsum Gergithiorum oppidum sedem Æneæ posterorum fuisse, idemque potissimum respici, illo Neptuni vaticinio? Quod si verum est et indubitatum, illud alterum de Roma Æneadarum colonia falsum esse necesse est, atque liquet ex illa vetere et genuina narratione hancce seculorum decursu defluxisse.

Cum igitur quæ de Æneæ in Italiâ adventu regnoque narratur ficta atque inventa esse evictum sit; facile animo succedere potest altera illa et contraria opinio: Græculum quendam invenisse eam fabulam Romanos terrarum tum dominos ab heroe Græci cognative populi derivari cupientem, quali studio Dionysius sæpe tam in transversum abripitur. Quem enim talis homuncio inter heroes mythici temporis, cum Diomedes et Ulysses aliis jam fati occupati essent, aptiorem invenire poterat quam Æneam, Trojanæ gentis casui solum superstitem? Athæc omnis opinio penitus concidit et corrui si observaveris, fabulam de Æneæ in Italiam adventu antiquiorem esse eo tempore, quo Græci Romana arma, Romani Græcas artes litterasque curarent et colerent. Jam primo bello Punico, si Petrus Ciaconius columnam rostratam recte supplavit, Romani Egestanos in Sicilia cognatos suos agnoscunt, quos a Troica stirpe deduci Thucydides auctor est. Multisque annis antea Timæus historicus in adytis Lavinii, præter alia vetustatis pignora, servari Trojanum nescio quod, ex ipsis ejus terræ incolis acceperat. Atque in tempora etiam priora nos revocat Dionysius,³ cui fidem ita derogare vix ausim, diserte affirmans: veteres annales pontificios, quos certe mox post reges exactos scribi cæptos esse scimus, Æneæ ad littus Latinum appellentis mentionem facere. Consentientes invenimus auctores Græcos, cosque antiquiores quam ut populo tum vixdum noto necdum nobili adlarentur. Lycophronis Alexandra obscuris vocum ambagibus plura de Æneæ circa Romanum regno pandit.⁴ Vix autem intelligi potest, quod Græcos tum permovere potuerit, ut urbi barbaræ tam insignem darent con-

¹ Str. xiii. 589. 616. Herod. vii. 43. Mermessus, Gergithius pagus, (Suidas) xl. stadiis aberat ab Alexandria Troade, Pausan. x. 12, 2.

² Γέργιθας τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν, vi. 122. cf. vii. 43. Apud Apollodorum iii. 12. s. Γοργυθίων (f. Γεργιθίων) inter filios Priami memoratus nomen habet de hoc pago.

³ V. i. 73. p. 184. Reiske.

⁴ V. 1273.

ditoreū, nisi fabulam ex Italia advectam accepissent. Et quam Græcus est, qui primus omnium Æneæ εἰς Ἑσπερίαν πλοῦν commemorat, nempe Stesichorus lyricus, ex cujus Πέρσαι Ἰλίου ducta esse, quæ in ima tabula Iliaca repræsentantur, inscriptio apposita docet; idem tamen est Siceliota Himeræus; atque probabile existit, ipsum famam hanc, quam cum popularibus suis primus communicaverat, relata accepisse ex Italia. Vides, quam antiqua memoria tradita sit ea fabula. Quo factum, ut ea jam nobilem antiquitatis æruginem traxerit, et publica quodammodo auctoritate comprobata fuerit, quo tempore Romani manus amicas jungebant cum Illeensibus, et quo tempore gens imperii appetens, Julii, ipsius originem ab Ænea repetere audebat. Neque igitur his temporibus debetur, quibus artes Græcæ invaserant agreste Latium, sed iis potius, quibus juvenes patricii nullam disciplinam, nisi Etruscam docebantur, et vix alios canendi modos callebant quam Saturnios Fescenninorum.

At quid profecimus hac disputatione hucusque? Nihil, confiteor, nisi id jam magnum aliquod et insigne putas, ut statum quæstionis accurate definire possimus. De hoc enim nunc liquet esse quærendum: quo nexu, qua via, quo fato evenerit, ut fama antiquitus tradita de Ænea, Trojanorum post casum urbis rege, jam ante Stesichori tempora transferretur in Italiā, atque ad origines Romanas adaptaretur, ibique publicam quandam et sanctam auctoritatem sibi conciliaret. Cui quæstioni ut satisfaciamus, veniam nobis expetimus, si primum in campum ab ea alienum evagari videbimur, cum hinc reduces quæ ad nodum extricandum maxime faciant allatuos nos esse confidamus.

Vix ulla Græciæ pars tot Apollinis sacris et delubris idolisque priscas religiones referentibus antiquitus erat ornata, quam litus Troadis. Sufficit memorare templum Cillæum in sinu Adramyttæno, delubrum Chryses Iliade celebratissimum, Smintheum, in quo Apollo conspiciebatur murem pede premens, Tenedum, quod deum exhibebat securi armatum ad vindictam,¹ oraculum Thyndræum, ubi poëtæ post Homerum Alexandram educatam ferunt, denique ædem in ipsa arce Pergamo Apollini cum Latona et Diana communem. Addere juvat delubrum Zeliæ, in qua urbe ad radices Idæ montis sita Apollo colebatur Lycegenes sive Lycius, cujus pium cultorem Homerus nobis exhibet Pandarum, Lycaonis filium, et de cujus sacris ipsa hæc regio Lyciæ nomen accepit.² Conditores autem horum sacrorum

¹ Steph. Byz. Τένεδος ex Aristide. Cf. quæ Plutarch. de Pyth. orac. xii. p. 266. Apollo bipenni armatus in numis Thyatiræ (Buonar. Med. ant. ix. 9.) et Pitane in Æolide (v. Mionnet. ii. p. 627. n. 722.) conspicitur.

² Iliad. viii. 827. iv. 119. v. 105. cum Schol. min. et Villos.

Cretenses fuisse pro certo habemus. Quod tum ex ipsa sacrorum natura ostendi potest, quippe quæ Creticam originem referant, tum ex antiquorum scriptorum auctoritate, inter quos eminet Callinus elegiacus. Qui si apud Strabonem Teucros e Creta advenisse docet, qui ad litus Trojæ appulsi Apollinis Sminthei sacra condiderint, id velim non de omni illa Teucrorum gente intelligas tam late patente, ut olim Herodoto teste omnem Thraciam et Macedoniam occupasse feratur, sed de singula quadam tribu, quæ sacra Apollinis secum attulerat et postea cum natione cetera penitus coaluit. Atque huic quidem narrationi magna sane fides inde additur, quod Cretenses antiqua traditione circa omne mare Ægæum sacrorum Apollinarium statores feruntur.¹

Hæc igitur sacra principes vetustæ Trojæ familias singulari sanctimonia atque observantia coluisse, Homerus pluribus locis diserte refert. Eumque referre, quæ vetere fama ac memoria acceperat, si modo talia fingere licuisset, probat singularis omnium, quæ de his sacris usquam memorat, consensus atque constantia. At enimvero e familiis, quas diximus, duarum potissimum mentionem facit. Alteram dico Panthoidarum Dardanicam, de qua postea etiam Novi Ilii tribus quædam nomen traxit.² Panthoum Apollinis sacerdotem refert Virgilius ex Arctino, ut puto. Idemque haud dubie agnoscit Homerus, cum Panthoi filium, Polydamantem, ab Apolline singulari quadam cura protegi et servari referat.³ Et vides idem fundamento esse veteri narrationi, ex qua Apollo Euphorbo Panthoida utitur ad Patroclum sibi infestissimum—plura enim e vetustis epopœis de odio Apollinis adversus Æacidas memorata invenio—interficiendum. Quem enim aptiorem eligere poterat deus quam gentilem familiæ, quæ peculiari quadam ratione sacris ipsius addicta erat? Quod quidem fatendum est in Homericis carminibus non satis aperte significari; sed nihil mirum, cum hæc poëtarum ætas causarum mythorum jam valde incuriosa fuerit. At enim Pythagoras, cum in Heræo Argivo ex anathematis affixis Euphorbi potissimum scutum ut suum, quod ipse nempe vita priore Euphorbus gestaverit, agnosceret,⁴ quo argumento perducere poterat, ut Euphorbi potissimum sibi personam ex omni heroum turba eligeret, nisi nexum illum bene noverat inter Euphorbum et sacra Apollinaria, quæ ipse Pythagoras vita ac doctrina quam maxime profitebatur?

¹ Quod caput veteris mythistoriæ bene tractavit Raoul-Rochette Hist. de l'établ.
t. ii. ² Walpole Memoirs p. 104.

³ Æacid. ii. 430. Iliad. xv. 522.

⁴ V. Heracl. Pont. ap. Diogen. Laert. viii. 1. et al.

At fortasse jam increpor vanus et captiosus mythologicarum λύσεων ostentator, ut qui nihil frugis afferam ad quæstionem, quam proposui, recte solvendam, atque in alienos plane campos lectores nimis indulgentes seducam. At jam propius accedimus ad caput quæstionis. Altera enim earum familiarum, quas ex Homero apparet sacra Apollinaria in patriis habuisse, sunt Æneadæ. Æneam enim Apollo præ ceteris anxie protegit, atque saucium in suum ipsius templum delatum, matris et sororis ibi medicinæ tradit.¹ Quid quod hunc heroem equi ferunt ex Apollinis pascuis prognati? Hinc probabile existit, Æneas haud minus coluisse Apollinem, quam Venerem, quam eos ex Phrygiâ adoptasse, Homericus in Venerem hymnus, ut censeamus, suadere videtur.

Nunc jam revoces in memoriam, quæ superiore disputationis capite constituimus. Hæc nempe: Trojanos superstites ducibus Æneadi in pago Idæo, Gergithe, consedis, atque multis seculis originis et fatorum ibi memoriam conservasse. Atque detulisse eo Æneas patrium Apollinis sacrum, non conjectura tantum assequimur, sed veterum auctoritate scimus. Erat Gergithe Apollinis templum, in quo ostentabatur sepulcrum Sibyllæ, quam numi Gergithii Sphinge significabant.² Est eadem, quam de pago quodam valde vicino Mermessiam,³ de universa regione Hellespontiam dicunt, atque inter celeberrimas Sibyllarum habetur. Antiquam harum mulierum fatidicarum ad templa Troica famam prodit fabula de Alexandra, quam quidem Homerus omittit, sed Posthomerici magnopere celebraverunt. Temporibus enim potissimum inter Homerum et bellum Persicum oracula, quæ Sibyllina credidit antiquitas, Gergithe, Erythris, Sami fusa esse videntur. Sed Sibylla Gergithia, veterum Teucrorum in sede, Æneadarum sub imperio, dei huic genti patrii ministra, quid sæpius atque intentius vaticinari poterat, uno debebat, quam quod magnæ nationis parvis reliquiis acceptissimum erat auditu: *Ilion Æneadarum sub auspiciis resurget?*

Cum huc pervenerimus, jam intelligitur, nunc hoc tantum desiderari ut demonstretur, qua via oracula, quæ ad Troadem spectabant, Romam transferri potuerint, et qui, quæ eventura prætendebantur, quodammodo jam evenisse credita sint. Quod qui fieri potuerit, jam videbimus. Redeundum denuo ad Gergithios, ex quorum historiis, quas scripsit Clearchus Solensis,

¹ Iliad. v. 416.

² Phlegon. ap. Steph. Byz. Γέργης. Quo item spectat tipus in numis Troadis Aug. Col.

³ Κώμη Γεργιθία Suidas Σιβυλλῆν. Quidam eandem dicunt Erythræam et Erythras oppidulum in Ida. Dionys. i. 55. p. 140. R.

plura nobis servata sunt. Scimus, Gergithiorum partem devenisse in Cumæam Æolidis, ibique pagum urbi patriæ cognominem condidisse.¹ Hac via devenit fabula de Ilio resurrecturo ad Cumæos, qui iidem Apollinis sacra eximie colebant, atque ab iis adoptata, et latius propagata est. Quo factum puto, ut Ænus, Cumæorum colonia ad Hebrum, Æneæ urbs diceretur.² Sed proxime conjuncti cum Cumæis Æolidis erant Cumani in Italia. Nam quanquam hæc Cuma inter colonias Chalcidicas haberi solet, Palæpolin tamen extruxisse scinus Æolenses ejusdem stirpis, quæ Cumam in Asiam devecta erat.³ Facili igitur transitu fabula de Ænea regni novi conditore ad Cumanos Italiæ pervenire novamque formam induere poterat. Sed hæc, quæ nunc posuimus, maximam partem conjecturæ sunt, quibus ne tantillum quidem ipse tribuerem, nisi aliorum argumentorum accederet consensus. Conjiciamus autem oculos in littus Cumæ. Videmus in summo montis cacumine templum Apollinis tam antiquum, ut vaga quadam fama Dædaleæ artis opus ferretur,⁴ in radice montis ingens Sibyllæ antrum; hic ferunt Æneam appulisse atque e Sibylla novi regni sedem expetisse. Mire hæc concinere fatendum cum iis, quæ de Gergithe observabantur. Nam et ibi Apollinis templum, Sibyllæ oraculum, Æneæque novæ sedes. Quæ luce clarius reddunt, fabulam de Ænea Cumam delatam esse una cum Apollinis sacris Sibyllinisque oraculis. Nempe Sibylla Cumana, ut Virgilius ex antiqua memoria tradit, carmina non ipsa pangebatur, sed a majoribus accepta et religiose servata sortium modo disponebat. Hæc autem carmina antiqua maximam partem eadem fuisse consentaneum, quæ in Troade sub nomine Gergithiæ Sibyllæ ferebantur; cui opinioni postea auctoritas accedet. Sed fortasse opponis: hæc si assensum tulerint, hinc necessarium evadere, ut Cuma ipsa, vel locus quidam valde vicinus Æneæ sedes, et novum illud Sibyllinorum Ilium designata sit; a Virgilio autem nihil tradi, nisi appulisse Æneam ad hæc littora, ut de fine laborum oraculum expeteret. Nimirum Virgilii tempore Cumana fabula jam fere evanuerat splendore urbis Romanæ superata; sed noli dubitare, antiquiore fama Cumæ viciniam Æneæ sedem habitam esse. Sic apparet Stesichorum nihil adhuc de Roma Æneæ domicilio, sed tantum de Cuma narrasse. Nam ipsi secundum tabulam Iliacam Misenus comes adjungitur, cujus nomen et fabula aperte respicit ad

¹ Apud Athenæum vi. 256. a. b. cf. xii. 524. a. Strabo xiii. 589. d.

² Ephorus ap. Harpocr. Αἰνός. Steph. Byz.

³ Str. v. 246. al.

⁴ Servius ad Virg. vi. 19. cf. Paus. viii. 24. 2.

Misenum, promontorium Cumānum. Ultra eum processisse, nihil suadet ut a Stesichoro relatum putemus. Magnam denique auctoritatem adderemus Cephalonem, scriptorem Gergithium valde antiquum, qui Romam et Capuam ab Æneæ filiis conditas refert, nisi Troica ejus ab Alexandrino grammatico, Hegesi-nacto, supposita esse sciremus.¹

Quid nunc impedit, quominus cursum nostrum Romam diri-gamus? Rem tenemus: Tarquiniorum sub regno, cum Roma mutuis cum Græcis Campaniæ commerciis floreret, a Cuma libros oraculorum Sibyllinos Romam translatos esse. Una ve-nerunt sacra Apollinis, quæ Italis ab origine plane incognita (ad audeo affirmare²) nunc primum locum in pratis Flaminiis nacta sunt, ubi postea anno U. 324. jussu librorum Sibyllinorum ades ἀλεξικάκου sive medici dei exstructa est, quæ diu sola erat in urbe.³ Quibus libros Sibyllinos inspicere datum, iidem autistites sacri Apollinaris, quos ad Græca verba interpretanda Græcos adhibuisse scimus interpretes.⁴ Quantum tum putabimus Græ-cæ religionis Græcorumque mythorum Roman defluxisse, et quantopere sacra aliena commixta cum popularibus, cum Ro-mani, quemcunque deum in carminibus hisce nuncupatum repere-rant, cum Italo quodam numine, si modo fieri poterat, compara-rent et confunderent, atque solo peregrino nata omni arte sua facere studerent? Larga sane hinc existit religionum Romæ explorandarum materies. Sed festinamus ad id, quod nobis pro-positum. Quid jam apertius, quam in carminibus Cumanis oracula fuisse de Troja instauranda et Æneadarum novo imperio, qualia Cumanos ex Asia accepisse demonstravimus? Hæc igitur Ro-mani eodem fere jure, quo Cuman, ad suam regionem refere-bant, Romamque novum illud Ilium dictitabant; quo posito cetera omnis fabula sponte sequebatur. In Sibyllinis quæ Dio-nysii Halicarnassensis tempore exstabant, aperta mentio erāt Æneæ in Italiam delati,⁵ sed hæc constat post incendium Sylla-num ex Iliade, Sami, Erythris collecta esse, quo certe evincitur Romanis etiam tum persuasum fuisse, oracula Sibyllarum Asiatica haud esse magnopere diversa ab iis, quæ quondam ipsi e Cuma acceperant.⁶

¹ Lycophr. 1273.—Dionys. i. 72. p. 180. Etymolog. Καπύη, 'Ρώμη.—Athen. ix. 393. d.

² In Saliaribus Apollinis nulla mentio. Arnob. adv. gent. ii. Sacra Faliscorum in Soracte nihil contra probant, cum Falerii in religionibus valde græcissaverint; neque APLU (quæ est Thessalica forma ΑΠΛΟΥΝ, Walpole, Travels n. iii. p. 506.) in pateris Etruscis.

³ Livius iii. 63. iv. 25. 20. Asconius ad Orat. in toga candid.

⁴ E Zonara vii. c. 11. ⁵ Dionys. i. 49. p. 121 quo respicit Tibull. ii. 5. 39.

⁶ Oracula Sibyllarum Gergithia atque Erythræa non multum discrepasse, evinci-

Absolvisse viderer hanc quæstionem, si eadem via demonstrare possem, qui factum sit, ut Julia potissimum gens sese ortam ab Ænea gloriaretur. Nam nil nisi verba dedisse C. Julium Cæsarem, cum ad funus filiae originem suam a Venere deduceret, vix probabile. Sed ita oriri poterat hæc hujus familiæ opinio. Julius erat, qui consul primum Apollinis templum sine sorte dedicabat.¹ Ex hoc tempore Julii sacra, quibus publice instituendis operam navaverant, semper in privatis suis habuisse videntur. Quo factum, ut C. Julius Cæsar Octavianus Apollini duo splendidissima exstrueret templa, Actiacum et Palatinum. Neque ignorat, qui poëtas ævi Augustei diligenter legit, a Virgilio et Horatio locis quibusdam Augustum Apollini comparari vel Apollinis nomine significari. Atqui vidimus, quam arcta intercesserit conjunctio inter sacra Apollinaria et fabulam de Ænea. Itaque facile fieri poterat, ut gens sacris illis addicta, atque in fabulis, quæ ad ea pertinebant, melius versata, quam ceteri, fabulosam sibi ex hisce sumeret originem. Quæ opinio a patre ad filium continua serie translata C. Julii Cæsaris tempore ad tantum auctoritatis succreverat, ut publice eam profiteri non cunctarentur. Sed quæ ad privatas familiarum traditiones spectant, obscuriora sane; neque hæc tanta persuasione ipse affirmaverim, quam quæ de Æneæ in Latium adventu explicando exposui.

CAR. ODOFR. MULLER.

NOTICE OF

THUCYDIDIS DE BELLO PELOPONNESIACO LIBRI OCTO. Ad optimorum Codicum fidem, adhibitis doctorum virorum observationibus, recensuit, Summaris et Notis illustravit, Indicesque Rerum et Verborum adjecit, CH. F. F. HAACKIUS, Vol. I. II. Lipsiæ, Hahn.

A MORE generally useful and compendious edition of this difficult historian has not been presented to the students in

tur e Pausania x. 12. 4. ἀφαιρούσιν ἀπὸ τῶν χρησμῶν. Etiam nunc in tertio libro Sibyllinorum veterum illorum Asiæ oraculorum vestigia cæstant, quanquam valde adulterata. V. Thorlæcii libri Sibyllistarum.

¹ Livius iv. 26.

Greek literature. From the préface we learn that for six years the Editor was intent upon the undertaking, which he has executed on a very judicious plan, preserving a happy medium between prolixity and brevity. Having observed how ill calculated the larger editions, as Duker's, the Bipont, and Leipsic, were for the improvement of readers in general, "nam et in notis, non sine tædio devorandis, sæpissime frustra quæras obscurorum locorum accuratam explicationem; et ipsius auctoris orationem, uberrimæ variarum lectionum farragini superstructam, inveteratis sed apertis et ex ipsis codicibus cognoscendis vitiiis inquinatam exhibent;" he conceived the idea of compiling one for their special use: "quod fieri posse videbatur," he proceeds to say, "duobus voluminibus non ita magnis, in quibus textus quidem ex fide codicum, adhibitis subsidiis criticis, quæ adhuc prodierant, tum emendatior, tum, meliore distincti-one inducta, intellectu facilius exhiberetur; annotationum autem is modus teneretur, ut non nisi obscuriora scriptoris verba et sententiæ illustrarentur, receptarum lectionum causæ demonstrarentur, rarius aliorum conjecturæ et commenta vel laudarentur, vel redarguerentur, nec omnino quidquam accesseretur, quod ad auctorem intelligendum minus necessario pertineret, lectoremque in obscura ejus oratione occupatum magis etiam impediret vel turbaret." The notes are arranged under the text, a method of infinite convenience to the reader, and yet too rarely adopted. It were indeed much to be desired, that the arrangement which obtains in the best editions of the Classics, of placing the Latin immediately before the eye, and throwing the notes into separate volumes, were reversed; the former being designed for occasional reference merely, but the latter for the elucidation of difficulties throughout. In the present work, a continued summary of the history runs immediately above the notes, the use of which is thus explained: "Summariis instruxi Thucydædis libros, partim quod inde quoque aliquantum auxilii peti potest ad scriptoris mentem recte capiendam, partim ut eorum rationibus inservirem, qui Historicum nonnisi rerum ab eo tractatarum causa evolvunt, et partem quandam narrationis raptim transcurrere volunt. Quamobrem ad lectorum usus aptius mihi videbatur, illa summaria per singulas, quo pertinerent, paginas distribuere, quam continua libris singulis præmittere; præsertim cum vidissem, eam rationem certe in historicis quibusdam aliis adhibitam plerisque placuisse."

The Editor takes an opportunity in the preface of thus recalling an emendation which he had been led to introduce into

the text : “ Libro 1. cap. 43. ‘cum recentioribus Criticis particulam τε in verbis καὶ Κερκυραίους τε expunximus, sine probabilitate, cum verisimilius sit, δὲ, quod præbent codd. Cass. Aug. Gr. Mosq., in τε corruptum esse. Vide ad 8, 68.” The passage in question stands thus : Καὶ Κερκυραίους τε τούσδε, μήτε ξυμμάχους δέχεσθε βία ἡμῶν, μήτε ἀμύνετε αὐτοῖς ἀδικοῦσι. The substitution of δὲ is evidently very harsh : τε is frequently redundant in Thucydides ; thus in 6, 103. we have a parallel instance : Καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς τε, ἐφ’ ὧν αὐτοῖς ταῦτα ξυνέβη, ἔπαυσαν : where the Editor has introduced γε into the text, but corrects himself in the *Curæ Secundæ* prefixed to the 2d vol. Again, in 6, 41. we meet with the following passage : Καὶ, ἣν ἄρα μὴδὲν δέησι, οὐδεμία βλάβη τοῦ τε τὸ κοινὸν κοσμηθῆναι καὶ ἵπποις, καὶ ὅπλοις, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἷς ὁ πόλεμος ἀγάλλεται : on which the Editor remarks : “ Abundat τε, nec est quo referatur. Fortasse ex γε ortum, et hoc reponendum est. Idem videbatur Abieschio.” Mss. do not warrant this substitution ; one only supplies a variation τοῦτο τὸ κοινόν : τε in this passage, if not redundant, may be expressed thus : *even should the state be furnished, &c.*

In 5, 47. the following note occurs : “ Ἐξορκούντων δὲ οἱ πρυτάνεις, i. e. adigant ad jusjurandum, vel exigant jusjurandum Prytanes.—Ceterum hac breviori imperativi forma ubique utitur Thucydides pro latiore illa in ἔτασαν. Et nuper apud Anglos docuit vir doctus, *Elmsleius*, etiam Herodotum et omnes priores non solum poëtas, sed etiam prosaicos scriptores hanc eandem formam solam usurpare ; alterius autem prima vestigia in Arches-trati, qui Aristotelis æqualis erat, versibus apud Athenarum, et apud Menandrum inveniri.” In the Addenda, however, prefixed to the 2d vol. this canon is shown to be not strictly accurate : “ Cum notam ad hunc locum scriberem, fugerunt me contraria apud Thucydidem exempla hæc : 1, 34. μάρτυρων. 3, 67. ὠφελεῖσθωσαν. 4, 92. extr. κτάνωσαν. 8, 18. ἔστωσαν bis. Quibus *Elmsleii* observatio refellitur. Adde Xenophi de Venat. 4, 5. ubi nunc editur μεταβίβτωσαν pro μετατιθέτωσαν, cursu persequuntur. De Vectig. 5, 5. ἐννοησάτωσαν.”

We shall allude to one more proposed emendation : “ Lib. 6. c. 54. dicitur Hipparchus, cum Harmodius corrupti se passus non esset, a vi quidem abstinere voluisse, sed contumelia cum afficiendum curasse *obscuro quodam loco* (ἐν τόπῳ δὲ τινὶ ἀφανεί, ὡς οὐ διὰ τοῦτο δὴ, παρεσκευάζετο προφηλακίων αὐτόν.) Quæras, cur potius in obscuro, quam propalam, quo insignior et acerbior esset contumelia ? Neque vero illata est obscuro

loco injuria Harmodio a Pisistratidis, sed publice in pompa instructuenda. Videtur igitur vitium latere in vocabulo ἀφανεί, et leg. ἐν τόπῳ δέ τινι διαφανεί, cum propter præcedentis syllabæ soni similitudinem hæc lectio faciliè depravari potuisse videatur."

To the 2d vol. are subjoined a Tabula Chronologica Rerum maxime memorabilium; an Index Chronologicus Temporum, quorum fit mentio apud Thucydidem; an Index Nominum et Rerum; and an Index Verborum, which is more properly an Index Græcitatibus, being very explanatory both of words and idioms, but reduced within narrow limits, in consequence of the Lexicon Thucydeum announced by Poppo.

NOTICE OF BURTON'S EDITION OF MANILIUS.

[*.* This article, by an eminent Scholar, is connected with the "*Observations on the Orations ascribed to Cicero*," which will be continued in a future No.]

[Extracted from the London Magazine, 1785.]

M. Manilii Astronomicon Libri Quinque. Cum Commentariis et Castigationibus Josephi Scaligeri, Jul. Cæsaris Scal. Fil. S. Junii Biturigis, et Fayi; his Accedunt Bentleii Quædam Animadversiones reprehensione dignæ; quibus omnibus Editor sua Scholia Interposuit. Opera et studio Edmundi Burton Arm. A. M. S. S. Trin. Coll. Cantab. aliquando Socii. Londini ex officina J. Nichols, venales apud T. Evans, the Strand. 1783. 8vo.

THE poet, of whom Mr. B. has undertaken to be the editor, is not, we believe, read very extensively, or admired very highly. Virgil is again and again perused by all scholars with invigorated curiosity and increasing pleasure. His elaborate phrasology is studied with critical exactness, and the splendid passages with which he abounds are faithfully remembered and familiarly quoted. The glowing and animated style of Statius will for ever preserve him from neglect. The interesting events which Lucan describes, and the profound observations upon

politics and philosophy which are diffused over his poem, are instructive to the historian, and interesting to the patriot. There are few scholars to whom Valerius Flaccus and Sil. Italicus are totally unknown; but Manilius is generally supposed to be destitute of every excellence which can attract the notice, or reward the labor, of modern readers. His philosophy, even where it is exact, contains no important information; and his astrology, though it be singular, does not furnish exquisite entertainment: he is barren of episode: in some of his exordiums he is tedious; and not one of his conclusions is wrought up with dignity or with pathos:—his metaphors are violent, and sometimes incongruous: his diction is harsh and intricate; and his numbers are neither supported with uniform grandeur, nor relieved by well-placed variety. For these reasons the whole of his work is toiled through by few readers; and few detached passages are selected from him as brilliant in quotation. Manilius coldly tells us,

“Ornari res ipsa negat, contenta doceri.”

And the justness of his assertion is abundantly verified by the tiresome uniformity of his work.—Lucretius acknowledges the difficulties he was to encounter,

“Propter egestatem linguæ et rerum novitatem.”

But he created beauties which his subject did not immediately furnish; and he enriched that language, the scantiness of which he deplors. He always reasons with the sagacity of a philosopher: he often describes with the enthusiasm of a poet. In those parts of his poem which are least entertaining, his verses, though rugged, are seldom feeble, and his sense, though obscure, is never trifling. In many parts he surprises and charms the most fastidious reader with the tenderness of his sentiments, the harmony of his numbers, and the splendor of his style.

But whatever be the imperfections of Manilius, we do not think him altogether deserving of the neglect into which he has fallen. As the works of Eratosthenes and Dorotheus Sidonius are not come down to us, Manilius may be considered as the depository of materials which otherwise would have entirely perished in the wreck of time. His observations upon the events of human life, upon the irresistible decrees of fate, and the awful dispensations of Providence, sometimes carry with them a pleasing air of solemnity. To the man of learning he will not be without use, in supporting canons of criticism; and to those who would excel in Latin verse; he may now and then supply assistance in diversifying those ideas which have been expressed

Notice of Burton's Edition of Manilius. 323

more successfully by abler poets of antiquity, and have been imitated more frequently by writers of later times.

We accede to the opinion of those who would place Manilius in the Augustan age, and we believe that he wrote about the close of it. The external evidence upon this point is very scanty and very indecisive; and to the peremptory assertions and undistinguishing praise of modern critics, it would not be entirely impertinent to oppose contradictions as positive, and censures as vehement, which may be found in writers of nearly equal authority. Our own opinion is, however, founded upon internal evidence; for, after repeated and attentive perusal, we have experienced what the sagacious and candid Gerard Vossius, who once thought differently, confesses with his usual fairness and simplicity, "*Legenti Manilium iterum iterumque, Augusti Temporibus videtur convenire.*" Voss. de Poet. We lay some stress upon the curious and well-known discovery of Bentley about the substantives which terminate in *ius* and *ium*. The older and purer writers among the Romans always used the genitive with a contraction. Propertius rarely and Ovid often, "*Geminum ii usurpant.*" This change was made, says Bentley, *senescente jam Augusto*. The change, when introduced, must have been extremely convenient to the writers of heroic verse; and yet we find only one instance in Manilius,

———Quod partibus ipsis

Dodecatemorii quid sit, &c.

Manil. lib. ii. 739.

In words purely Roman there is no instance whatsoever. The frequent mention of Augustus's name in different parts of the poem; the solemn introduction and melancholy relation of the calamities which overtook Varus in Germany, vid. lib. i. v. 896; the very marked terms in which he speaks of Rhodes, to which city Tiberius retired in a gloomy mood, and which is called by Manilius

———Hospitium recturi principis orbem. *Lib. iv. 762.*

all conspire to increase the probability of the hypothesis we have embraced. The passage last quoted inclines us to think (as we before said) that he lived late in the Augustan age; and we oppose it to the assertion of Bentley's nephew, who (because Manilius abstains from the use of the genitive in *ii*) concludes *illum visisse ante hunc inductum morem*. It is not possible perhaps to ascertain the precise period; but the historical circumstance upon which we insist is at least of equal weight with the verbal criticism of Thomas Bentley: and there is no violent absurdity in supposing, that Manilius intentionally avoided a metrical

usage which had been introduced so recently, and of which he found no example in the most admired writers of his own day.

That he was an Asiatic, is matter of mere conjecture: for, much as we have heard of the wild luxuriance which in the time of Tully and Augustus distinguished Asiatic prose, we have no certain marks for extending the name to any poetry which then was in fashion. The attempt to prove this conjecture would be equally unsuccessful with the endeavors of a critic, who might wish to establish by particular instances the general charge of Patavinity which Pollio alleged against the style of Livy, and which Morhoff has refuted by a train of deep and decisive reasoning.

The merit of Manilius, as a poet, stands at an immense distance from that of Virgil: yet, in the opening and in the close of the first book, he seems to have had his eye upon the conduct of Virgil in the first Georgic. In the structure of many verses, and in the turn of many expressions, there are traces of imitation of different passages in all the Georgics. Manilius, in his second book, expatiates with very striking minuteness upon the works of Hesiod and Aratus. He meant, probably, to insinuate that Virgil was much indebted to these authors; and afterwards he asserts his own claim to originality in these remarkable words:

——Nulli vatum debemus orsa:

Nec furtum, sed opus veniet. *Lib. ii. 57.*

His apprehensions probably were alarmed, and his envy in some degree excited, by the recent and high celebrity of Virgil's poem.

The imperfections which swarm in the poem of Manilius may be assigned with much greater probability to other causes, than to the age in which he lived. His subject was dreary, and almost untrodden. It was not often susceptible of poetical embellishment (as he himself acknowledges), nor was it always capable of a luminous and pleasing arrangement.

Hoc operis non vatis erat—*Lib. iiii. 41.*

But the poet himself surely was unfortunate or imprudent in choosing a subject, the difficulties of which he was unable to conquer by invention or by judgment, by the vigor of his genius, or by the elegance of his taste.

From Manilius we turn aside to Mr. B.—Editors usually view their authors with a partial eye. They exaggerate every beauty, justify every peculiarity, and extenuate every fault. But Mr. B. is superior to all these prejudices. In every fourth or fifth page he indulges himself in a strain of abuse or ridicule

Notice of Burton's Edition of Manilius. 325

against the obscurity of Manilius. He sometimes seeks a shelter for the harshness of his own interpretations in the greater harshness of the original. He holds out scarcely any passages as deserving praise for the justness of the thought, or the elegance of the expression. We are at a loss, therefore, to assign any reasons which should induce Mr. B. to be the editor of a work which he is sometimes unable to understand, and never disposed to commend.

The principles of astronomy now rest upon a more solid foundation, and the doctrines of astrology are exploded with just and universal contempt. The matter of Manilius cannot therefore supply instruction to the reader, and his manner gives offence even to his fastidious editor.

There are critics who are suspected of proportioning their fondness for an ancient writer to the corruption of his text, or the darkness of his meaning. They "poach in unlicensed Greek" for the sake of displaying their skill in explanation, or their felicity in conjecture; they transfer to their author some little share of the admiration and love which they feel for themselves. Ridiculous as may these prejudices be in themselves, they have sometimes operated upon the strongest minds: they have given rise to many useful discoveries; and have exercised to purposes of harmless ostentation the brightest and happiest talents that ever were employed in criticism. Mr. Burton, however, does not seem to be possessed of such abilities, or actuated by such motives. His remarks are not very numerous or very important: they do not display either profound thinking or extensive reading. They are laid out unnecessarily upon expressions which the most common reader cannot mistake; and upon those which stagger the most learned, they are seldom bestowed with distinguished success. We conclude, therefore, that Mr. B. reserves the treasures of his critical knowledge for opportunities more favorable. He is content to be a wit against Manilius; but upon a Virgil or a Lucretius he will condescend to show himself a critic of the first magnitude.

To this exalted appellation he doubtless must have some title, as in the front of the work he challenges Bentley in terms of pointed defiance, and as in the course of it he persecutes the sturdy hypercritic with the most distinguished and unrelenting severity; sometimes skirmishing with him in petulant ridicule, sometimes venturing to grapple with him in close argumentation, and sometimes endeavoring to crush him under a mass of coarse and scurrilous invective. We admire the heroism of this beha-

viour, while we doubt its justice. Bentley, whose ear was practised in the nicest discriminations of metre, and whose sagacity had been employed, during a long and studious life, in tracing the radical principles and idiomatic phraseology of the Greek and Roman tongues, has attempted, in some instances successfully, and in others, it may be, rashly, to separate the genuine text of Manilius from spurious interpolation. Mr. B. provoked, it should seem, at the presumption of his predecessor, and jealous, no doubt, of his fame, admits indiscriminately almost every line which he could find in every edition. Dr. Bentley, in endeavoring to establish canons of criticism, is often ingenious, seldom mistaken, and never dull. Mr. B. neither condescends to adopt the canons which other critics had proposed, nor ventures to produce any of his own. Dr. Bentley brings forward parallel passages in support of his observations. Mr. B. gives weight to his remarks from the perspicuity with which he supposes himself to have explained them, or from the confidence with which he appears to impose them. Dr. Bentley errs by rule, Mr. B. is right without it. “Utri credere debetis, Quirites?”

We are surprised that Mr. B. has never borrowed any assistance from the edition of Manilius which Stœber published at Strasburg in 1767. If his design was to illustrate Manilius, he might perhaps have found that design anticipated by the labors of Stœber, whose notes, to say the truth, are useful, though his erudition was not very extensive, nor his discernment very acute. If his ambition was to expose the errors and to degrade the reputation of Bentley, he would have found his prejudices against this imperious Aristarch confirmed by the strictures of critics, whose abilities are superior to his own, and whose writings seem hitherto to have escaped his notice. For his entertainment rather than for his justification, we will produce some passages which Stœber has exultingly inserted in his preface, but to which, in every instance but one, we confidently refusé our assent.

“Vides, Lector, annos fere quadraginta a Bentleio in edendo Manilio desudatum, ut hinc spem conceperint eruditi, opus tandem proditurum tale esse, quale adhuc orbis criticus non viderit. Jam, cum manibus nostris expectatus diu liber tenetur, haud pauci sunt, qui vix centesimam spei suæ impletam esse partem conqueruntur.”

To this censure which Menkenius throws out against Bentley, Stœber certainly accedes; and in many of his observations he has endeavored to show the justness of it. Stœber speaks with great respect of the *Exemplar Manilii regio Montanum*

which, was published in 1472,* and which has been, unpardonably in his opinion, neglected by succeeding editors. The readings of this edition he compared with the Codex Parisiensis, and found nearly similar. The *variæ lectiones* of the Paris manuscript were communicated to Bentley by Montfaucon. But Bentley, it seems, *silentio sane quam pervicaci eas sprexit; noluit vir ille acutissimus nisi obsequentibus sibi, libris uti*. This censure is much too harsh and indecorous. Bentley ought to have produced the readings, whether they tended to support or to invalidate his own criticism. But, in appreciating their value, we should have been inclined to prefer the judgment of Bentley to that of Stœber. Mr. Burton will read with triumph the reasons which Stœber assigns for Bentley's contemptuous treatment of the Paris manuscript, and the use which he professes to have made of it in his own edition.

"Negligendum putavit hunc codicem, cujus lucidissima scripturæ veritate ipsius in corrigendo temeritatem infractum iri pulchre intellexit. Nos equidem eo impensius gratulamur et libro Ms. et nobis. Illi quidem, quod ejus lectiones non tam male sunt habitæ ab Aristarcho Britauno, quemadmodum cæteris e libris exceptæ, cujus rei specimina passim leges in adnotatione nostra: nobis autem, quod prima hujus codicis collatione pensiculatus facta, pristinum Manilio reddere splendorem, novum addere commentationi nostræ, potuimus."

In their inclination to vilify Bentley, the London and the Strasburgh editors appeared to be "Arcades ambo:" but in their talents for opposing him, Mr. Burton must yield the palm to Stœber. The latter has so far given a proof of his condescension or his candor towards Bentley, as to reprint the same text in the same form. But in respect to the celebrated emendation in the fifth book, Stœber partly condemns what Mr. Burton most vehemently and most justly applauds.

Sic etiam in magno quodam *respondere* mundo.—*Manil.* v. 735.

Mr. Burton is so pleased with Bentley's conjecture of *respublica*, as to give it admission into his own immaculate text. "Omni laude (says he) prosequendus est Bentleius qui hunc versum ita legit." Stœber thinks and speaks in a very different strain. "Mire deformavit Bentleius." He laughs at Bentley's zeal to exclude *respondere* as a word of the third conjugation, and yet he acknowledges that Scaliger was unsuccessful in attempting to defend it by his quotations from Martial and Valer. Flaccus.—Let us hear what he would himself substitute.

"Nobis magis placet resplendere quod vel e vetusto cod. vel e conjectura dedit Reinesius. Et illud correptam admittit penultimam.

Cujus quidem rei causam dum mecum studiosius inquiri subvenit forte fortuna commodissima. Nostroque dignissima, observatio Senecæ, qui, Nat. Quæst. Lib. 2. Cap. 56. Etiamnum, ait, illo verbo (fulgere) utebantur antiqui, correpto, quo nos producta una syllaba, utimur. Dicimus enim ut splendere sic fulgere.—At illis ad significandum hanc e nubibus subitæ lucis exceptionem (de fulgure loquitur) mos erat, media syllaba correpta, ut dicerent fulgere. Quid ergo vetat, quominus credamus et pro certo affirmemus. Nostrum ad instar antiquorum non magis ingenio poetico quam Mente Philosophica, eaque vel homine Christiano dignissima, scripsisse resplendere, ad significandum actus celeritatem, qua quidem natura, quæ Nostro Deus hos stellarum ordines in cælo resplendere fecit.”

We have transcribed so large a portion of this note because we were unwilling to strip it of any force which it may be thought to possess; because we conceive the confidence of its author to be insufficiently warranted by his reasoning; and because the admirers of Bentley will be strengthened in their conviction of his sagacity when they see the weakness of his opponent. We are at a loss to find either poetic beauty or philosophical wisdom in the meaning which Stæber affixes to the passage: we think all analogical reasoning from the simple to the compound verb, precarious: we do not recollect the word *resplendere* in any Latin poet; we are confident that neither *fulgere*, nor *splendere*, nor *stridere*, nor *effervere*, nor any words of the same kind are to be found in the whole poem of Manilius:—Bentley’s conjecture on the contrary recommends itself not only from the metre which is indisputable, but from the sense which is clear, apposite, and even beautiful.

Of Mr. Burton’s edition we have to add, that it may be useful to school-boys who wish to rove over a dark and visionary writer; or to naturalists who may here and there pick up some straggling facts relative to the astronomy of the ancients. But to that class of readers who are conversant in the refinements of taste, and in the researches of criticism, it will not supply any large share of instruction or amusement.

ITINERARY OF

Achmed ben El Hassen,² from Fas to Tafilelt;³ with explanatory notes.

Praise be to God—there is neither power nor virtue but from God.⁴

ACHMED ben El Hassen el Metsyouwi, the humble slave of the Most High God, to whom God be propitious, performed this journey in the reign of the Prince of believers Muhamed,⁵ our Sultan, son of Abdallah, son of Ismaël, Shereef El Hassany, during the month of Jumad Attheny, i. e. the second Jumad in the year 1201. (Answering to the latter half of March 1787.)

1st Journey.—We departed from the town of Fas, and, continuing our journey, we arrived at the station called Darouda-bibagh, which belongs to our Sovereign above-mentioned: there we passed the bridge of Seboo,⁶ when, after passing through barren and stony places, we reached a country abounding in olive plantations, where we discovered the town of Safrou, rendered very agreeable by the gardens and fine vegetation of the

¹ This Itinerary is in a collection of Mr. Paulus, intitled *Memorabilien*, in 8vo, Leipsic 1791. t. i. p. 47. Mr. Paulus translated it from the Arabic into Latin, and as he has not given the original, it is here translated from a French version of the Latin.

² Ben El Hassen should be Bel Hassen, for the *n* in *ben* loses its sound when followed by the article *el*. This grammatical rule does not seem to be known by the Arabic scholars of Europe, or at least it is not observed by any of them.

³ The orthography, in the Latin and French translations, is Fez, Tafilet; but they are in the original Arabic Fas, Tafilelt. طافيلت * فاس

⁴ It were useless to notice the little inaccuracy of the translation of such passages as the following (which do not interfere with the Itinerary), were they not calculated to confuse the Arabic student, who ought to be informed that such a translation as this, of the original Arabic, is incomplete; the Arabic words being

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَحْدَهُ * وَلَا حَوْلَ وَ لَا قُوَّةَ إِلَّا بِاللَّهِ الْعَلِيِّ الْعَظِيمِ

which signifies, "Praise be to God alone; for there is neither virtue nor power but from God, the high, the eternal!"

⁵ This Muhamed was the father of Soliman, the present Emperor of Marocco. He is called *Emer el muneneen*, Prince of believers, in the original Arabic.

⁶ Kuntera Seboo in the original, which is the bridge over the beautiful river Seboo, not far from its source. This great river rises in the Atlas, passes Fas, and discharges itself in the Atlantic ocean, at Meheduma, south of the lake, and in Lat. N. 34°. 15. See the Map in Shabeeny's account of Timbuctoo, page 55.

adjacent country. The river Šebou also, which passes through the town, renders this place still more agreeable, turning numerous mills.

2nd Journey.—We departed from this place and reached, by stony and rugged ways, a mountain, at the foot of which is a hill called Mouddou Fayraoun,¹ and a plain called Zogari Ahmar. Afterwards we arrived at a place called Scheb-Etsoubn, and, after passing near the river Waugiel, we entered the place named Aiyune-el-asna,² where we passed the night. At this place is a plain abounding in grass, and of such a prolific vegetation, that it surpasses all description. We made but little way this day, although we travelled on from the dawn of day till noon.

3rd Journey.—After having passed stony and barren mountains and crossed several streams, we reached a place called Nehr-Merdou, inhabited by a tribe of Berebbers called Ait Shagrushe; then descending the mountain of Tseniets-Elbaks, we reached the banks of the river Dgigou, near to which stands the castle of Tsagouts, inhabited by another tribe of Berebbers called Ait Djusie; here we passed the night.

4th Journey.—Departing from the Castle of Tsagouts we again passed over a country stony and barren, mountainous and full of precipices, and we arrived at El Kebure Etsuats, or the Tombs of Etsuats, so called because three and twenty men perished in the snow on mount Immon Djaniba. This mountain is very lofty, and much snow falls there. At the foot of this mountain are many towns; that which is called Kâsar-Etsionsi is surrounded with a river. We sojourned at this place, after having passed but a short distance this day.

5th Journey.—We traversed the plain called Zerghou, where there is neither water, plant, nor animal. We afterwards saw, a little out of our way, a place called El Mewêlah, where there is a salt spring. In traversing the canton of Chaïmasourray we discovered two ruined villages, called Didjaroutama, from whence we continued our course towards a high mountain called Sabets-beni-Oubêid, stony, barren, and full of precipices, which, they say, forms the limits of the state of Marocco, and which extends to Tripoli. At the foot of this mountain runs the rapid and tremendous mountain-stream, the Muluwia, upon which are

¹ This is most probably *Medina Farawan* in the original Arabic, i. e. the town of *Pharaoh*. The least mistake in the letters might make the variation.

² Where the French orthography of Arabic words does not suit the English pronunciation, we have altered the orthography to the English pronunciation: thus this word عيون Aiyune, which signifies springs, is written in the Latin translation, Ouyoun.

barks carrying sails. On either bank are gardens and villages, called Uksabi Sherifa, (i. e. the Castles of Princes). After a difficult and laborious day's march, we sojourned at this place, and passed the night.

6th Journey.—We continued our journey, and after having passed mount *Ugres*, we came to the place called *Selamoum-Aleikume*, and then to the river *Serbouherb*; travelled almost the whole of this day without finding water, after which, we found a little in one place only, called *Ras-el-ma*.¹ After reaching the village *Nuzlet-Tirwan*, we were obliged to pay the tribute which they require from all Caravans. All this country forms a desert, without plants, stones, or animals. We did not proceed far this day.

7th Journey.—After having passed mountains, and barren and stony valleys, we reached a group of villages, called *Gers*, inhabited by Berebers, of the tribe *Ait-adough*,² so called from their depravity and hostility to travellers: these villages are scattered on each side of the river *Ziz*,³ which is the river of *Tafilelt*.

8th Journey.—Pursuing our journey through the plain, we reached a place called *Elthching*. Departing from this place travellers proceed, during the whole day, among mountains and stony valleys, and difficult passes. At length we came to a vilage called *Zaabl*, where the caravan was subjected to another contribution. After which, it arrived at the towns of *Tsemrakest* *Ait Sotsman*, *Jafry* and *Ben Iéfuse*, where there are gardens and palm trees. The passage of the caravan this day was laborious, not from the distance which we travelled, but from the difficult ways and steep declivities which we passed over.

9th Journey.—We departed, and from this territory we entered the region called *El Medghara*, and immediately afterwards we reached the strong castles *Es Soke*, *Kasser Jedide*, and *Kasser Muley Abdallah ben Aly*. Here we discovered the finest palm trees in the world, and the finest roses.⁴ When the agriculturists of this country sow their seed, they steep the seed in pools similar to what are used for the making of salt; and, by the blessing of God, the seed thus sown produces abundantly.

¹ i. e. The spring of water.

² *Ait Adough* it should be, but it is in the Latin translation *Aistadough*, which is probably an error of the press.

³ The river is called *Wed Ziz* or *Wed Fefelly*, i. e. the river *Ziz*, or the river of *Tafilelt*. It is common for rivers in Africa to be called by different names. Thus the *Neel El Abeed*, or *Neel Sudan*, or *Niger*, has a dozen at least given to it by the various nations through whose territories it passes.

⁴ *Es Soke Kasser Jedide*, i. e. the market of the new Castle. *Kasser Muley Abdallah ben Aly*, the Castle of *Muley Abdallah* the son of *Aly*.

⁵ These are called *El Word ficelly*, i. e. the *Tafilelt* rose, vide *Sha-*

10th Journey.—After having passed these strong castles we discovered a spring, sometimes called Ain-Miski, and sometimes Ain Tutugelt: this spring could scarcely be equalled for the good quality, as well as abundance, of its water, which serves the inhabitants also for building; to irrigate their corn, palms, and all other plants. From there, we reached the river Ziz, before mentioned, and passing along its banks, across woods of palm trees and orchards, we entered the district of Retseb. We perceived during this day several strong castles: viz. Kasser Eulad Èaïsa,¹ Kasser Eulad Amyra,² Kasser-Tsatchiamets and Kasser El Muarika, built by Seedy Muhamed, the Emperor of Murocco before mentioned. We also saw in this region a strong castle called Kasser-Muley El Mamune,³ which is the best and most curious of them all. Plantations of palm trees are everywhere seen, and cultivated fields fertilised by canals of irrigation. The distance passed this day was inconsiderable.

11th Journey.—We now passed an uninterrupted plain, barren, without palm trees, without water, without plants, without inhabitants, the abode of antelopes, ostriches, and other wild animals. This territory is dangerous, being infested with robbers. We afterwards arrived at a village called Tzetzimi: here begins the territory of Tafielt. We now arrived at strong castles called Sabbah⁴ by the inhabitants, and which are situated in a vast plain. We then crossed the river Ziz, and after passing by several towns surrounded by plantations of palm trees,⁵ we came to the beautiful palace called Dar el Beida,⁶ built by our victorious King, by the Grace of God. Not far from this palace is the fortress called Erisani, called also Ebou-Amm.

beeny's account of Timbuctoo, page 79. It is similar to the China rose; is powerfully fragrant. From the leaves of the Tafielt rose is made the celebrated distillation called otto (instead of attar) of roses.—These roses are noticed by the English Anacreon:

"There too the Haram's inmates smile,
Maids from the West, with sun-bright hair;
And from the garden of the Nile,
Delicate as the roses there."—Lalla Rookh, 7th Ed. p. 322.

¹ Kasser Eulad Èaïsa, the Castle of the Sons of Èaïsa. We should write it in English, Woled Àïsa.

² The Castle of the Sons of Amyra.

³ The Castle of the Prince El Mamune.

⁴ There were probably seven Castles, as the word Sabbah implies.

⁵ The palm or date trees of Tafielt are remarkably productive.

⁶ The palace of Dar el beida, an Arabic term signifying the White House, was built in the early part of the reign of the Sultan Seedy Muhamed, the stones and marble being transported across the Atlas from the ruins of Pharaoh. See enlarged edition of Jackson's account of Marocco, note, p. 41; also Shabeeny, p. 80.

Such are all the places, all the regions and deserts, which we saw during the journey above mentioned, in the reign of our prince; and we implore for us and all Muhamedans the mercy of God.

This Itinerary was written and composed the ninth day of the month Jumad Atthenie,¹ year 1203 (q. d.) 1789. A. D.

The position of Tafilelt, from whence a caravan departs every autumn for Timbuctoo, is tolerably well ascertained by the above itinerary, which corroborates that of Shabeeny. I have said, that it is eight horse journeys from the ruins of Pharaoh to Tafilelt, or 15 caravan journeys. The information recorded by me in my account of Morocco, and in Shabeeny, respecting Tafilelt, I procured partly from intelligent Moors who had often performed the journey, but principally from Signor Francisco Chiappé, an Italian gentleman, whom I knew well, and who had been European chargé des affaires, or Minister for European affairs, at the Court of Morocco, during a great part of the reign of the Sultan Seedy Muhamed, father to the present Emperor. He was a gentleman of great veracity, and had accompanied the Emperor personally twice from Fas to Tafilelt. My description of the country, rivers, and soil east of the Atlas mountains is exclusively from him. He had an itinerary, which he showed me at Laraiche, of both journeys, from which he allowed me to take extracts, and would have given them to me if I had expressed a desire to have them: but Europe at that time was not so interested in discovering Africa as it is now. I have every reason to think Signor F. Chiappé's report perfectly correct. I have neither added to, nor diminished from, it, but have given an epitome of his observations. I think it expedient thus publicly to declare this circumstance, as it is now become valuable to know on what authority or foundation our intelligence rests respecting the interior of North Africa; Mr. Walckenaer, the intelligent author of *Recherches Géographiques sur l'intérieur de l'Afrique Septentrionale*, observes, page 281, "Ainsi donc les renseignements qu'a obtenus M. Jackson, s'accordent avec ceux de l'Itinéraire d'Achmed relativement à la position de Tafilelt."

Mr. Walckenaer, page 279 of his interesting work, the principal object of which is to fix the position of Timbuctoo, doubts

¹ The French translation of this itinerary has it Dgioumadit; but there is no such month in the Muhamedan Kalendar: there is the month of Jumadellule and Jumad Atthenie, q. d. the first Jumad and the second Jumad. That this itinerary is dated in the second Jumad is unquestionable, as the Latin translation has it mensis gemaditsania, which is but a slight variation from Jumad Atthenie, if not an error of the press.

the existence of a river E. of the mountains of Atlas which runs from the South West to the North East,¹ and he observes that it is probably an error of the printer, and therefore turns this river from the North West to the South East; for in quoting a passage from my account of Marocco he says, “Une rivière qui prend sa source dans la chaîne d’Atlas arrose cette vaste plaine, et coule du Nord-Ouest au Sud-Est.” What authority the learned geographer has had for turning the course of this river, or for reversing my words, or why he should imagine it more probable to run South East into the great desert, than North East into the desert of Angad, I know not. Hamed bel Hassen has not informed him that the river Ziz or the river Filelly so runs; but if he had so informed him, I can only say that his report differs from that of my friend Signor F. Chiappé, whose intelligence was never doubted, whose veracity stands unimpeached.

The learned geographer² thinks I have placed Tafilelt too near the ruins of Pharoah in my map: and as the true situation of Tafilelt has now become important, as auxiliary to the discovery of that of Timbuctoo, I should think it reprehensible were I to omit making the following observations, on which I shall leave the intelligent reader and learned geographer to

¹ Jackson’s Account of Marocco, enlarged Ed. p. 22.—I have said that Tafilelt is 15 caravan journeys from the ruins of Pharoah:

6 among the mountains in craggy serpentine paths,			
at 10 English miles a day	-	-	60
9 in the plains, at 20 do. a day	-	-	180
			—240 miles.

I have also said that Tafilelt is 8 days from the ruins of Pharoah, horse travelling, viz —

3 days among the mountains, at 20 miles a day	-	-	60
5 days in the plains, at 35 miles a day	-	-	175

—235 miles.

Signor Chiappé performed this journey from Fas to Tafilelt in 9 days and a half, travelling 8 or 10 hours each day. And I think if we ever shall perform the journey we shall find it nearly as here stated, taking the medium, viz. 237 English miles, or 203 geographical miles; thus there is a difference of 12 geographical miles between my calculation and that of Achmed bel Hassen.

² “M. Jackson, dans sa carte, place Tafilet beaucoup trop près des Ruines de Pharaon d’après la distance qu’il indique dans son texte. Ces contradictions ne doivent pas nous surprendre. Ce sont les habitans du pays bien instruits qui ont fourni à M. Jackson les matériaux de ses descriptions, mais ce ne sont pas eux qui ont dressé sa carte.” Vide Walckenaer, *Recherches géographiques sur l’Afrique*, &c. p. 280.

make their deductions. With regard to M. Walckenaer's opinion that Tâfilet has been placed by me, on the map, too near the ruins of Pharoah, I should observe, that although the map here alluded to was made principally to show the track across the Sahara to Timbuctoo, yet Tâfilet is considered to be, by all those who have performed the journey, distant in a right line from Marocco, two-thirds of the distance which it is from Fas: this on a reference to my map of the track of the caravans, will be found to be the case. Some allowance should also be made for the windings of the road, in the mountains of Atlas, which appear to have been overlooked by M. Walckenaer, and which are so circuitous that they prolong the journey out of all proportion with the lineal distance to Tâfilet. I conceive this to be another argument in favor of my position of Timbuctoo, as marked in my map of the caravan tracks.

JAMES G. JACKSON.

REMARKS ON

Mr. Bellamy's New Translation of the Old Testament.

PART II.—[Concluded from No. 51. p. 131.]

IN the beginning of the 21st chapter, two different events are related; one is the destruction of the cities and people of King Arad, the Canaanite, and the other is the setting up by Moses of the brazen serpent. The first of these subjects Mr. Bellamy, rejecting the authorised version, on account, I suppose, of its want of perspicuity, translates as follows: Ver. 1. *Now the Canaanite, king of Arad who dwelt in the South, heard when Israel came by the way of the spies; and he fought against Israel, and took some of him captives.* 2. *Then Israel vowed a vow before Jehovah, and he said, Surely delivering, thou wilt give even this people into my hand, and I will separate their cities.* 3. *Now Jehovah, &c. &c.* My reason for quoting these verses, Sir, is to show that Mr. B. has here been guilty of an error, which no one, acquainted with the simplest rules of Hebrew construction, could commit. In the passage just quoted, he has rendered the words נָתַן יְהוָה *delivering, thou wilt give*, mistaking the infinitive for a present participle, and thus manifesting his ignorance of the idiom of the language. I will now quote for his benefit the words of the learned Buxtorf upon this peculiar

construction of the Hebrew: "*Verbum finitum quodvis regit suum infinitum, ad majorem certitudinem et evidentiam exprimendam.*" "*Infinitum sæpius præcedit et sub prima radicali notatur cum Kametz, si in Kal sit et ex verbis perfectis aut bisyllabis, perfectorum formam imitantibus: ut, מִכָּל עֵץ-הָאֵלֶּךְ אָכַל תְּאֵבֶל. Ex omni arbore horti comedendo comes, Gen. ii. 16. hoc est, libere, prorsus comes.*" See Thes. Gram. p. 498. And again, "*Quando infinitivus sequitur, tum continuatio et frequentatio indicatur:*" ut, וַיְבָרֵךְ בְּרוּךְ אַתָּם. Et benedixit benedicendo vobis, Jos. xxiv. ver. 10, *hoc est, subinde, sine intermissione benedixit vobis.* Thes. Gram. p. 499.

In this chapter the 8th and 9th verses are thus rendered in the authorised version. 8. "*And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live.*" 9. "*And Moses made a serpent of Brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of Brass, he lived.*" This translation has hitherto been supposed to convey very fairly and literally, the meaning of the original, and which is, in this passage, by no means obscure. But "*objectors*" have, it seems, been busy, and that is quite sufficient to induce our learned author to put forth his gigantic strength, and crush them. This desideratum he accomplishes in two ways; first, by a new version of the passage; secondly, by a note to explain it, consisting of more than three pages, at once argumentative, critical, and didactic. His rendering as usual is remarkable, as well for its perspicuity as for its grammatical accuracy. Ver. 8. "*And Jehovah said to Moses, Prepare before thee a serpent which set before him for a sign; then it shall be, whosoever shall be bitten, and looketh to him, that he shall live.*" 9. "*Then Moses prepared a serpent of Brass, and he put it for the sign, so it was, if the serpent had bitten a man, when he trusted through the serpent of Brass, then he lived.*"

Part of the note which is, not unaptly, attached to this "*New Translation,*" I will quote as a specimen:

"The Clause וְשִׁים אֹתוֹ עַל-נֵס *ve sim otho gnal nees*, is rendered, *and set it upon a pole.* The word אֹתוֹ *otho* is translated by the neuter pronoun *it*; but it is a compound word, of אֵת *oth*, *by, before, on, to, &c.,* and וָ *vau* postfixed, the pronoun *him*, as in the following clause of this verse. Heb. *Before him.*" Our learned critic has here confounded the conjunction וָ *vau* in וְשִׁים with the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר *which*, and has so obviously shown

his ignorance of the word *אֵשׁ*, that it would be a waste of time to dwell upon it. He then proceeds to show his critical acumen on *שֶׁרָפָן*, rendered in our version, "a fiery serpent:" in his observations on this word, he introduces the Seraphim, Cherubim, the Egyptian Serapis, and Joseph; but I have not been able as yet to discover the precise meaning of this part of his note. Our Critic, in the 32nd verse of this chapter, again tries his skill on a subject, which makes a prominent figure in his introduction: but before I proceed to examine this verse, I shall, in order to obviate the charge of misrepresentation, quote the most material part of what Mr. B. has written upon this head.—"Serious errors," he says, "have also been made by those translators who have translated according to *Keri*, and others, who have translated according to *Chetib*. It may be necessary to explain these terms. The *Keri* translators endeavour to give the sense of the text, and frequently omit some important word, or attempt to alter the original. But by *Chetib* is meant the true text, which should be translated so as not to reject a single word in the original. Hitherto the *Keri* and *Chetib* translators stand opposed to each other, and have been so understood even by Jews themselves, ever since the dispersion of that people." And again, "I have therefore endeavoured to reconcile the *Keri* translators, or those who have attempted to give the sense of the passage, by rejecting a word or words, with *Chetib*, or those who have adhered to the whole of the original text, who must have given the true sense when they abided by the very letter; and these were the ancient Hebrews. Had the *Keri* translators understood the *accentual reading*, there had been no necessity for them to have rejected any part of the sacred text; there would have been no necessity, as has been asserted by the later Masorites, for *לֹא לו*, i. e. *not*, to be read as *לו לו*, *to him*; and so for other words." Without making any observations on the confused ideas of our Critic on the subject, I shall merely remark that, notwithstanding the lofty position which he has assumed on this occasion, he has, with the exception of two passages, followed like all other translators the *Keri* reading in his new translation of Genesis; and in those two passages Mr. Whittaker has shown him to have been guilty of the most flagrant violation of grammar. Although there are between 70 and 80 *Keri* readings in the *Pentateuch*, the one which I am about to examine is, I believe, only the third which Mr. B. has attempted to "*reconcile with the Chetib*;" and his attempt

¹ Introduction, p. 16.

in this instance, is equally unfortunate as it was in the two passages in Genesis. The translations of the 32nd verse of the 21st chapter stand thus in the Old and New versions :

Authorised Translation.

And Moses sent to spy out Jaazer, and they took the villages thereof, and drove out the Amorites that were there.

New Translation.

Also Moses sent to explore Jaazer, and they took the villages thereof, and he expelled the Amorites that were there.

Upon this verse our author writes this note: "*And drove out.* Heb. *And he expelled.* The Keri translators suppose an error in the text, and have recommended the word *וירש* *varesh*, rendered, *and drove out*, to be written *וירש* *yoreesh*. But this would make it the participle Benoni, or active, and surely nothing would be gained by it; for whether we say he *drove out*, or *driving out*, the Amorites, it amounts to the same. *The English translation is certainly correct here, and the Keri translators are decidedly wrong.*"

On turning to this verse in the original, it will be perceived that above the word *וירש* *vayoresh*, is the masoretic circlet pointing to the margin, where we find *וירשן* with a *vau*, instead of the latter *yod* of the former word; and it requires the greatest ignorance not to see the propriety of the substitution of the Keri for the Chetib. The word comes from *ירש*, a verb defective in the first radical. In the Hiphil conjugation it changes its first radical *yod* into *vau cholem*, in the Hophal conjugation into *vau shurek*, and it is on account of these and other changes that the verb is called irregular or defective. Now in the word in the text, *וירש*, there still remains the first radical *yod* unchanged, and, which is contrary to every rule of grammar, it is pointed with *cholem*, a vowel which properly belongs to *vau*. As it is therefore impossible that both the consonants and the vowels in this word can be right, the Masorets, or whoever were the authors of the Keri notes, have very properly directed the *yod* to be expunged in the reading, and a *vau* to be inserted.

But, says Mr. B., this amendment of the Masorets would make *וירש* the PARTICIPLE BENONI, or ACTIVE! Let me tell this Critic, that *וירש*, the amendment of the Masorets, is a verb of the third person sing. masc. fut. Hiph. with *vau conversive*, (such also is the word in the text, with the exception of the irregularity which has been pointed out by the Masorets,) and nothing else. I beg leave to inform Mr. B., that the participle Benoni belongs as well to the passive as to the active

voice; and of this he may easily convince himself by a slight inspection of any Hebrew grammar. In return for this information, I would ask Mr. B. to inform me who the "Keri translators" are; and where I can find a translation which, rejecting the Keri notes, confines itself to the Chetib? If this information be not given in the next communication which Mr. Bellamy may think proper to give the public, your readers will think that by such phrases as "*The English translation is certainly correct here, and the Keri translators are decidedly wrong,*" our author had no other object in view, than by a pompous display of seeming erudition to delude the uninformed part of the public.

Mr. B., Sir, is not long before he finds another subject on which he may, with great advantage to the public, exercise his critical acumen. The 22nd chap. of Numbers, containing the history of Balak, and of Balaam and his ass, is the field upon which he has determined to meet the Enemies of the Bible, and to vanquish them, by showing, that although their objections are good against the authorised translation of this part of sacred writ, yet, when made against a faithful representation of the original Hebrew, (*and such his own "New Translation" undoubtedly is,*) they lose all their substance, and vanish into air. For my own part, Sir, if I had the power, I would decree Mr. Bellamy, for his *victory* on the present occasion, the honor of a *Triumph*, though some, not being able duly to appreciate his merits, or, like the "Publishers of Bibles," being envious of his talents, might think him amply repaid by that of an *Ovation*. It would occupy too many of your valuable pages to give a minute analysis of Mr. B.'s labors and discoveries on this subject. He has found out, that *U mi*, in the 9th verse, which has been supposed by all, Jews as well as Christians, ever since the dispersion, to be an interrogative pronoun, is neither more nor less than a verb, and that it ought to be rendered "*Beware,*" as he says it is in 2 Sam. chap. 18, ver. 12.; that Balaam was a priest under the Noatic dispensation; that his ass never spoke, and that the apostle, who alludes to the subject, does not mean to say that he did speak. These, and other discoveries equally instructive and entertaining, with a vast quantity of criticisms and explanations to support and elucidate his "*New Translation,*" may be found in the 15 columns of closely printed commentary on this chapter, which, fortunately for mankind, our learned Critic has thought fit to edit. The subject of Balaam is continued in the two succeeding chapters; and the lovers of elegant language, erudite criticisms, and splendid theories,

cannot fail of finding their most sanguine expectations realised by perusing the text and the notes.

Before I conclude, I will introduce to the notice of your readers a sample or two of the manner in which he has chosen to reply, in his "Critical Examination of the Objections made to the New Translation of the Bible," to the observations of Mr. Whittaker.

In number 129 of his Appendix, Mr. W. points out Mr. Bellamy's erroneous translation of Genesis, xlix, 10.; his words are as follow: "קָרַת (Heem. noun fem.) 'And unto him (shall) the gathering of the people (be).' *King's Bible*. 'Then the people shall *congregate* befel him.' *New Version*. Any attempt to arrive at the meaning of this extraordinary phraseology being quite beyond the scope of human ingenuity, we can only observe, that the New Translator has rendered a noun substantive in Hebrew, not by a verb, as in former cases, but by *two verbs*."

That I may not be supposed to misrepresent him, I will quote his own words as they appear in pages 45 and 46 of his *Critical Examination*, &c.:

"In a work of such magnitude, on account of the multiplicity of reference to different passages, errors in correction, hence faults in some copies arising from accidents in printing, where letters have dropped out of the form, and wrong ones put in, it is to be expected that some errors will be made. One of this description I will mention, concerning which any impartial reader will see that it has been occasioned by the negligence of the press. It is one which will show the deliberate misrepresentation of this writer, in the most glaring colors, as he is abusive about an error he has made himself, but which he charges on me. Gen. xlix, 10. *And unto him shall the gathering of the people be*, (authorised version). I translate the passage, *Then shall the people congregate BEFORE him*. That is, at the coming of the Messiah, the sacred writer says, *Then shall the people congregate BEFORE him*; viz. in divine worship. In the word *before*, the letters *fore* were drawn out by the printing-balls, and the letters *fe* were put in, so that in some of the copies the word is *befe*, instead of *before*. Now it is hardly possible to believe that any writer would act so dishonorably as to put in the letter *l*, in order to make it *befel*? Was he not aware that by accusing me of such gross ignorance it would have a tendency to injure me, by causing a stagnation to my work? After our critic has put in the letter *l*, to make the word *before* a verb, he then says that I translate the clause

thus : *Then shall the people congregate* **BESSEL** him. And he further observes, *Any attempt to arrive at the meaning of this extraordinary phraseology being quite beyond the scope of human ingenuity, we can only observe that the New Translator has rendered a noun substantive in Hebrew, not by a verb, but by two verbs.* If this gentleman had been in his sober senses, he could not have made such a blunder surely. If I had rendered this word as a verb *befel*, which our critic has done for me, this would not be rendering it by two verbs. He ought to have known that the translators have^e put in a *verb* and an *article* in this short clause of seven words, for which there is no authority in the Hebrew. The meaning of our critic, I suppose, is, that the word יקח *yikhath*, rendered *the gathering* in the common version, and the word *before*, which he has made a *verb*, make the two verbs which he palms on me. I believe there is but another passage in all the scripture where the word יקח *yikhath* is found : it is in Prov. xxx, 17 ; it is the infinitive of the verb *to obey* ; viz. *and refuseth* (ליקח *likhath*) *to obey*. Will our critic inform his readers how the same word, with the same vowels, in this verse in Genesis, is converted into a *noun* ? But he must remember that there is no authority whatever for the article *the* ; viz. *the gathering* : so take away the article *the*, and the word *gathering* remains in the common version, which some grammarians would call a *participle*."

The way in which Mr. Bellamy, in the above quoted passage, accounts for the mutilated appearance of *before* in his New Translation, may, for aught that I know of printing, be correct. But can any body conceive that Mr. Whittaker added the *l*, to make out his charges of ignorance against Mr. B. ? No one who has read Mr. Whittaker's book and whose opinion is worth having, will, for a moment, pretend that he did so. In criticising the work of almost any other writer than Mr. B., his opponent would naturally have supposed that an error, for which the author was not accountable, had, in some way or other, been committed : but, unfortunately for Mr. Bellamy, the masses of error, which are to be found in almost every page of his New Translation, rendered it more probable to the mind of Mr. Whittaker that an *l* had slipped out from the end of the word, than that two letters had disappeared from the body of it. The language which our author has thought fit to apply to his opponent can injure nobody but himself. With regard to the observations of Mr. Bellamy on the word יקח, no one who has advanced a step beyond the alphabet of the language can entertain a doubt that Mr. W. is perfectly right in representing it to

be a Heemantive noun feminine, and, consequently, that it is truly rendered in the national version, "*the gathering*."—But Mr. Bellamy, notwithstanding the lapse of more than a year between the publishing of his "*New Translation*" and his "*Critical Examination*," declares, in the latter work, this noun *קָהָה* to be an infinitive, which, in the former, he had represented as the third person sing. future : and this too, on the authority of the *Common Version*, on which he has bestowed so much unqualified abuse. He finds, from his concordance I suppose, that *קָהָה* (the same word with the preposition prefixed) occurs in Proverbs xxx, 17, and that it is, in the King's Bible, which none of its numerous advocates pretend to be literal, rendered "*to obey*;" and having discovered from Lindley Murray that "*to obey*" is the infinitive of the English verb, the New Translator concludes, and "*some grammarians*" may think *naturally* enough, that the Hebrew word which it represents, must of necessity be the infinitive also. He then proceeds, "Will our critic inform his readers how the same word, with the same vowels, in this verse in Genesis, is converted into a noun? But he must remember that there is no authority whatever for the article *the*; viz. *the gathering*: so take away the article *the*, and the word *gathering* remains in the common version, which *some grammarians* would call a *participle*." Does Mr. Bellamy wish this to be considered as a proof of his assertion that the Hebrew is the most certain and correct language in the world? He first converts a noun substantive feminine, into a verb of the third person singular future; after the lapse of a year, he declares it to be the infinitive; and then, to crown the whole, says that there are "*some grammarians*" (and this *Vindicator* of the Hebrew does not find fault with them) who would call this unfortunate *noun* a *participle*.

In number 9 of his Appendix, Mr. Whittaker shows Mr. Bellamy's improper translation of Gen. iv, 4., "*וַיָּבֵא* (3rd pers. sing. pret. *Iliph.*) 'And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock.' King's Bible. 'But Abel, came even with firstlings of his sheep.' New Version. Mr. Bellamy's interpretation would have been correct, had the original been *נָבָא* (3rd pers. sing. pret. *Kal.*) See Grammar."

In number 65 he in like manner animadverts upon Mr. B.'s version of Gen. xxiv, 1. "*נָבָא* (part. *Ben. sing. masc.*) 'And Abraham was old, (and) well stricken in age.' King's Bible. 'Now Abraham was old: the days had come.' New Version. This error is similar to that noticed in Art. 43."

That your readers may have the whole matter before them, I will quote the whole of Article 43. "Gen. xviii, 11. **וְהָיָה** (part. Ben. pl.) 'Now Abraham and Sarah (were) old (and) well stricken in age.' King's Bible. 'Now Abraham and Sarah were old, the days *had come*.' New Version. This would require the Hebrew to have been **וָהָיָה** (3rd person pl. *pret. Kal*), even allowing the accent Siphcha to convert this word into a *pluperfect* or *remote preter*. Mr. Bellamy has also omitted the preposition prefixed to the ensuing word."

Now all these observations, Sir, being evidently at first sight in strict accordance with the grammar of the language, your readers will wonder what objections the most fastidious critic could possibly make to them. Mr. Bellamy, notwithstanding, attacks them with great asperity, and congratulates himself on having obtained a complete victory over his antagonist. That I may avoid the charge of misrepresentation, I will quote all that he has said on this subject. "But as this gentleman has boasted of the liberality of the Syndics of the University in defraying the expense of his work, why did they not first call upon him to correct his book, when he had made such unpardonable errors in grammar? See in his Appendix, art. 9, where he says **וָהָיָה** *baa* is the third person singular preter in *Kal*; and art. 65, where he declares that the very same word is the *participle active*. And yet this gentleman pretends to be a grammarian, and pompously sends forth an Appendix, stating this and others to amount to one hundred and thirty-four errors in the New Translation. Surely this has escaped the eye of the learned Syndics of the University, or they would not have countenanced by their purse and authority the publication of a work, the author of which, as it evidently appears, cannot conjugate a simple verb, in Hebrew. Now in consequence of his having made a verb, *befel*, where I have made a preposition, *before*, I suppose he thought it would give him a plausible opportunity, among others, of saying, as he has said in the following words, *Any attempt to arrive at the meaning of this extraordinary phraseology being quite beyond the scope of human ingenuity, we can only observe that the New Translator has rendered a noun substantive in Hebrew, not by a verb, but by two verbs*. This gentleman has been hurried on by his passion to misrepresent the New Translation. If he regard his honor, or the credit of his profession, he will acknowledge his error publicly."—*Critical Examination*, page 48. He resumes the subject in page 128: "But this objector says, 'Mr. Bellamy's interpretation would have been correct, had the

original been **נָל** *bāa*, third person singular preter, Kal ; see grammar.' But with all this gentleman's parade about grammar, what will the learned and unprejudiced reader say to his grammatical, not to mention critical, knowledge, when in the Appendix, No. 65, on Gen. xxiv, 1, he tells his unconscious reader, that this very word **נָל** *bua*, which in No. 9 he positively declares to be the third person singular preter in Kal, he as positively, in page 316, No. 65, declares to be 'the participle Benoni (active) singular masculine.' There needs no other argument to prove this gentleman's utter defection in the grammar of the sacred language. It would be absurd indeed to translate 2 Kings x, 21. *there was not a man left that COMING not*, instead of, *there was not a man left that CAME not*. Ch. xxv, 8. *COMING Nebuzar-adan, captain of the guard*, instead of, *CAME Nebuzar-ad-an, captain of the guard*.—Thus it is properly translated in the preter tense *came*, in above a hundred places in the authorised version, and in above fifty as I have rendered it. This objector, however, calls this one of the one hundred and thirty-four errors in the New Translation. The reader will see, that whether the New Translation be sanctioned by the grammar of the Hebrew, or by the authorised version, this gentleman and his party must condemn it. I have, in the course of the last ten years, met with many such sciolists, who have passed themselves off for great Hebrew scholars, but who did not know a *noun* from an *adverb* in Hebrew ; others who, like our critic, could not distinguish the THIRD PERSON SINGULAR Preter from the PARTICIPLE BENONI SINGULAR MASCULINE."—page 129.

Our author gives his opponent the *coup de grace* in page 142, where he thus writes :—" Gen. xxiv, 1. **נָל** (participle Benoni, active, sing. masc.) 'And Abraham was old and well stricken in age.' *King's Bible*. 'Now Abraham was old: the days had come.' *New Version*. See on Gen. iv, 4. where our critic says that this word is the third person singular preter."

It is impossible, Sir, that any one not entirely unacquainted with the very rudiments of Hebrew grammar, could indite such matter as I have just now quoted ; such observations as these can excite no other feeling than pity for the ignorance and presumption displayed by their author.

Had we not the fact before our eyes, we should be apt to deem it impossible that any one, presuming to instruct others, could be so deficient himself in the very first elements of his profession. Here, however, we find Mr. Bellamy making it a matter of grave charge against his opponent, that he has consi-

dered ~~N~~ in one place to be a verb and in another a participle. This alone would be sufficient to show the illiterate habits of this gentleman, and ought to convince him how totally unfit he is to meddle with subjects of this description. Let me, Sir, beseech this author to turn to Buxtorf's *Thesaurus*, and there he will see that in *Kal* the 3rd. pers. sing. masc. pret. and the part. Ben. sing. masc. of verbs having *vau* for their second radical, are alike as well in consonants as in vowels; he will also find from the above learned performance, (and not from that only, but equally well from any other,) that verbs with *vau* for their second radical in *Kal*, have the sing. masc. imp., the sing. masc. part. pret., and the infinitive, all written alike. Nor is this resemblance of one part of the verb to another confined to this conjugation or to this description of verbs; our author will, if he take the trouble to examine, discover it in almost every conjugation and in almost every description of verbs; and the only possible way, as you well know, Sir, in which it can be determined whether, in such case, a word is the preterite, or whether it is the participle, whether it is the imperative or whether it is the infinitive, whether it is a noun or whether it is a verb, or any other part of speech, is by attending to the construction. Of this Mr. Bellamy seems to be ignorant.

I have now, for the present at least, done with Mr. Bellamy; and sorry am I not to be able to recommend him to the notice of your readers for any literary excellence. I may, Sir, at no very distant time, in order to prevent delusion, and to re-assure those whose minds may have been troubled by his assertions of the defective state of the National Translation, introduce him again to your readers; I may then present to your view some of the errors and misrepresentations of which he has been guilty, in what he calls "*The Anti-Deist*." In the mean time, if he should think fit to reply to any of the observations which I have felt it my duty to make in the preceding pages, let him do what he promised to do in his "*New Translation*," and which if he had done no one would have complained: let him, in short, produce authority for his assertions and opinions; for unless they be corroborated, they will be of no weight whatever with any one at all conversant with the subject.

COMICORUM GRÆCORUM FRAGMENTA;
SPECIMEN EDITIONIS A G. BURGES.

No. II.—[Continued from No. XLIV. p. 288.]

SEMER jam fragmenta quædam Comicorum Græcorum, a Plutarcho conservata, tractavi in *Cl. Jl.* N. 44. p. 277 et seq., iterumque alia, utcunque lacera, quæ scriptori eidem, hac in parte, pretiosissimo debentur, componere libet.

Verba Historici in Periclis vita, T. 1. p. 153. D. ita vulgantur: Τῶν δὲ Κωμικῶν ὁ μὲν Κρατῖνος ἐν Χείροσι στάσις δέ, φησιν, καὶ πρεσβυγενὴς χρόνος ἀλλήλοισι μιγέντε μέγιστον τίκτετον τύραννον, ὃν δὲ κεφαληγερῆταν θεοὶ καλέουσι, καὶ πάλιν ἐν Νεμέσει, μόλε δὲ Ζεὺ ξένιε καὶ μακάριε· Τηλεκλείδης δὲ, ποτὲ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ἠπορημένον καθῆσθαι φησιν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει καρηβοροῦντα, ποτὲ δὲ μόνον ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐνδεκακλίνου θόρυβον πολὺν ἐξανατέλλειν· ὁ δὲ Εὐπολὶς ἐν τοῖς Δήμοις πυθανόμενος περὶ ἐκάστου τῶν ἀναβεβηκότων ἐξ Ἀίδου δημαγωγῶν, ὡς ὁ Περικλῆς ὠνομάσθη τελευταῖος, ὅτι περ κεφαλαῖον τῶν κάτωθεν ἤγαγε.

Atqui scripsit, aut debuit scribere, Plutarchus, Τῶν δὲ Κωμικῶν ὁ μὲν Κρατῖνος ἐν Χείροσι,

Στάσις δὲ καὶ πρεσβυγενὴς Κρόνος ἀλλήλοισι μιγέντε μέγαν ἔτικτετον κόρανον, ὃν κεφαληγερῆταν καλέουσι θεοὶ

Τιτάνα,

καὶ πάλιν ἐν Νεμέσει,

— [εἴ τι] μέλει σοὶ Ζεῦ σχίνου μακροκάρανε,

Τηλεκλείδης δὲ

ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τῶν κοινῶν ἀποροῦνθ' ἦσθαι καὶ κραταβαροῦντα,

ποτὲ δ' αὖ νεῦμ' εὖ κινεῖν κεφαλῆς ὅλον τ' εἶναι δεκακλίνον

[οἶκω, καί,] φασί, πόλει [κείνον] θόρυβον πολὺν ἐξανατέλλειν,

ὁ δὲ Εὐπολὶς ἐν τοῖς Δήμοις, πυθανόμενος περὶ ἐκάστου τῶν ἀναβεβηκότων ἐξ Αἴδου δημαγωγῶν, ὡς ὁ Περικλῆς ὠνομάσθη τελευταῖος, λέγει,

Ὅπερ κεφαλαῖον τῶν κάτωθεν ἦν, ἄγεις—

Inter hæc nonnulla tam sententiæ quam metri causa emendavi supplevique, partim ope Codicum, ingeniique partim.

In primis Κρόνος vice Χρόνος exhibent Varr. Lectt. Optime. Etenim πρεσβυγενὴς Κρόνος est populus, quem sub persona senis in scenam introduxit ipse Comicus in Equitibus; idemque jure dici poterat Κρόνος eo sensu, quo ridetur Justus in Nub. 929. Κρόνος ὦν. Quod ad πρεσβυγενὴς cf. omnino Aristoph. Nub. 358. χαῖρ' ἡ πρεσβῦτα παλαιογενές: neque omitti debet Pla-

tonis Comici fragm. apud Hephæst. p. 51=91. Χαῖρε παλαιό-
γυνων ἀνδρῶν θιαστῶν, Εὐλόγοι πάντ' ἀσώφων: ita enim lego vice
παντισόφων: Comicus etenim vulgus vilipendit. Dicitur πάντ'
ἀσώφων ut πάντ' ἀρίστῳ in Cratineo apud Plutarch. in Cimon. 1.
p. 484. E.

Mox vice μέγιστον τίκτετον Var. Lect. exhibet τίκτετον τιτάνα.
Atqui Τιτάνα, ni fallor, est initium versus proximi, intermediis
omissis. Ipse igitur dedi μέγαν ἐτικτέτην κοίρανον propter me-
trum. De κοίρανον et τύραννον vel inter senarios permutatis vid.
Porson. ad Prom. 994. Hinc intelligas de Pericle fuisse dic-
tum illud Comici, nescio cujus, apud Plutarch. 11. p. 985. Α.
Πεντήκοντ' ἀνδρῶν λίπε Κοίρανον Ἰππίος Ποσειδῶν: ita enim lego
vice ἥπιος: quod prætervidit Gaisford. ad Hephæst. p. 265.
Dein Homericum νεφαληγερέταν in κεφαληγερέταν consulto mu-
tavit Comicus. Fuit enim Pericles capite immenso. Mox δν—
καλέουσι θεοὶ Τιτάνα est parodia Homerici Χαλκίδα κικλήσκουσι
θεοὶ, ἄνδρες δὲ Κύμινδιν. Hic vero per θεοὶ intelligas Comicos
poëtas; quorum testimonia in hanc rem allegat Schol. ad Platon.
p. 139. Κρατῖνος δὲ Ὀμφάλη τύραννον αὐτὴν (scil. Ἀσπασίαν)
καλεῖ, χειρῶν Εὐπολὶς Φίλοις, ἐν δὲ Προσπαλτίοις Ἐλένην αὐτὴν καλεῖ
ὁ δὲ Κρατῖνος καὶ Ἥραν, ἴσως ὅτι καὶ Περικλῆς Ὀλύμπιος προσηγορεύ-
ετο. Ibi cetera sunt expedita; at hæreo in Χειρῶν. Alicui
pöterat ibi latens videri vocem Χειρῶσι: mihi vero exquisitius
aliud placet. Etenim collato Plutarcho 1. p. 165. D. ἐν ταῖς
Κωμωδίαις Ὀμφάλη τε νέα καὶ Δηϊάνειρα καὶ πάλιν Ἥρα προσαγο-
ρεῦεται, malim et in Schol. legere Δηϊάνειραν, et in Plutarcho Δη-
άνειρα. Huc enim respexit Hesych. Δηϊάνειρα, ἡ ποιοῦσα τοὺς
ἀνδρας γυναικῶν ἱρᾶν. Similiter Helena, quo nomine appellatur
Aspasia, est dicta ἑλανδρος in Æsch. Agam. 689. Quod ad
Cratini verba ipsa, ea quæ in animo habuit Scholiastes, citat
Plutarchus 1. p. 165. E. ita legenda. Ἥραν τε Διὶ τὴν Ἀσπα-
σίαν ἐτικτε, καὶ Καταπυγούνη τὴν παλλάχην κυνωπίδα: fabulæ vero
nomen esse Ὀμφάλη tam e Scholiaste quam Plutarcho conjici
potest. Mox illa verba tam Scholiastæ, quam Hermogenis
Περὶ Πραγματ., p. 33. Ald., Περικλῆς Ὀλύμπιος referenda sunt ad
Aristoph. Ach. 529. qui locus misere depravatus ita corrigi
debet:

ἐντεῦθεν ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου κατεβράγη
Ἕλλησι πᾶσι, καὶ τριῶν λαικαστριῶν,
σπινθήρος ὀργῇ Περικλέης Ὀλύμπιος
ἥστραπτ', ἐβρόντα, ξυνεκύκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

ubi vice ἐντεῦθεν repetiti, dedi σπινθήρος: quod plane tuetur ipse
Comicus in Pac. 607. Ἐμβλαὼν σπινθήρα μικρὸν Μεγαρικῷ ψη-
φίσματος Ἐξεφύσησεν τοσοῦτον πόλεμιν, ὥστε τῷ κατὰ Πάντας

Ἑλληνας δακεῦσαι: quem locum respexit Tzetz. ad Hesiod. *Erg.* 238. uti jam monuit Gaisfordus, ἔχεις σπινθῆρα Μεγαρικὸν, δι' οὗ Περικλῆς συμφορῶν τὴν πᾶσαν Ἑλλάδα πεπλήρωκεν. Certe nisi mentio fiat σπινθῆρος, vix et ne vix quidem intelligi potest ἥστραπτε, ἐβρόντα. Pericles enim σπινθῆρα manu gestans fuit Jupiter alter πυρφόρος. Neque id mirum. Alibi etenim, ut ad Plutarchea redeam, Jovis nomine appellatur Pericles a Cratino, teste Plutarcho 1. p. 160. A. Ὁ σχινοκέφαλος Ζεὺς ὁδὶ προσέρχεται Ὁ Περικλῆς, τ' Ὡδεῖον ἐπὶ τοῦ κρανίου ἔχων: cujus ope illico emendavi verba corruptissima μοι.ε ω ζευ ξενιε και μακαριε, legendo [εἴ τι] μέλει σοι Ζεῦ σχίνου μακροκάρανε. Et sane Var. Lect. exhibet μακροκάρηγε, quod Amyotus reddidit *longue tête*, a Xylandro non satis bene intellectus. H. Stephanus quoque e Vet. Cod. allegavit var. lect. μέγιστε pro ξένιε, scđ perperam, ut opinor, diversitatem annotavit; pertinet enim μεγιστε ad μοι.ε ω ζευ. Ipse inde erui [εἴ τι] μέλει σοι Ζεῦ: at in ξενιε manifesto latet σχίνου. Facete Pericli, qui dictus est Ζεὺς, curæ esse fingitur σχίνος: quæ vox olim depravata in Aristoph. *Δαναῖδ.* Fragm. xvi. apud Suid. v. Αὔλειος, ita corrigitur a Meinek. in Menandr. Quæst. p. 37. Πρὸς τὸν στροφέα τῆς αὐλείας σχίνου κεφαλὴν κατορύττειν: quo modo et Dobræus et ipse in Not. Mss. emendavimus.

Ne quis vero de μα in μακροκάρανε producto hæreat, is conferat similia in Nub. 335. ὑγρᾶν. Lys. 551. Κυπρογένεια. Av. 216. ἔδρας. 555. Κεβρίονα. 579. ἀγρῶν. 686. ὀλιγοδρανέες. Vesp. 672. ἀλλ' ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη.

Quod ad Teleclidis verba spectat, illud in primis est monitu dignum, quod Plutarchus nunc Poëtarum ipsa verba, nunc sententias Poëtarum suis verbis ornatas, allegare solet. Inde fit, ut, e sermone soluto difficulter metrum erui possit. Atqui collato Teleclidis altero fragmento, quod metro scriptum eodem L. C. Valckenaer in Diatrib. p. 222. primus eruit e Plutarch. 1. p. 161. E.

A. Πόλεων τε φοροὺς—B. αὐτάς τε πόλεις—A.* τὰς μὲν δεῖν—B. τὰς δ' ἀναλύειν—A. Λαίνα τείχη τὰ μὲν οἰκοδομεῖν—B. τὰ δὲ ταῦτα πάλιν καταβάλλειν—A. Σπονδὰς—B. δύναμιν—A. κράτος—B. εἰρήνην—A. πόλεμον τ'—B. εὐδαιμονίαν τε (ita enim legi debet ille locus, ubi duæ personæ interloquuntur, quarum altera Periclis facta laudat, altera vilipendit), molimine nullo, erui, quæ textus, denuo refictus, exhibet.

Plutarchus quidem, Periclis studiosus, scripsit ὑπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡπορημένον καθῆσθαι φησιν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει καρηβοροῦντα; atqui Comicus sales mordacissimos in Periclem ingessit, διὰ τῶν κοινῶν ἀπορροῦνθ' ἥσθαι καὶ κραταβαροῦντα. Fuit nempe

Pericles in rebus publicis ad agendum tardior. Id patet e Cratino apud Plutarch. 1. p. 160. *πάλαι γὰρ αὐτὸ (scil. τὸ ᾿Ωδεῖον). Λόγοις προάγει Περικλῆς, ἔργοις δ' οὐδὲ κινεῖ*: patet quoque e Thucyd. 11. 21. οἱ Ἀχαρνῆς ἐκάκιζον τὸν Περικλέα, ὅτι στρατηγὸς ὢν οὐκ ἐπεξάγοι.

Mox erui δ' αὖ νεῦμ' εὖ κινεῖν κεφαλῆς e* δὲ μόνον ἐκ κεφαλῆς, memor eorum, quæ scripsi ad Æschyl. Suppl. 30. de Jove annuente. Redde οἶόν τ' εἶναι—*φασὶ κείνον, aiunt eum esse potentem*. Dein intelligi nequit κεφαλῆς ἐνδεκακλίνου. Ipse, memor locutionis οἴκος ἐπτάκλινος apud Plutarch. 11. p. 130. E., necnon apud Athen. p. 47. F. et 205. D. οἴκος—*πεντάκλινος*, et mox F. οἴκος—*τρισδεκάκλινος*, hic reposui οἶκος. Τῶ δεκακλίνω οἴκῳ significatur plebs Attica in decem tribus divisa. Unde intelligas et corrigas Aristoph. Eq. 54. *λέgendero παραπέμψατ' ἐφ' ἐν δέκα κώπαις vice ἑνδεκα*: ubi tamen κώπη est *digitus*, remota similis.

His tribus Comicatorum locis addere poterat Plutarchus et alia de Periclis capite immani dicta. Nempe ad verba Aristoph. Nub. 997. *Τοῖς Ἰπποκράτους υἱέσιν εἴξεις, καὶ σὲ καλοῦσι βλιτομάμμαν*; ita Scholiastes; οὗτοί εἰσι Τελέσιππος, Δημοφῶν, Περικλῆς διαβαλλόμενοι εἰς ὑδρίαν καὶ Εὐπολὶς φησιν ἐν Δήμοις Ἰπποκράτους τε παῖδες ἐμβόλιμοι τινες βληχτὰ τέκνα καὶ οὐδαμῶς τοῦ τρόπου. Eupolidis verba proxima citat Suid. in *Βληχάμενοι* et *Εμβόλιμοι*. Scholia olim, quam hodie, auctiora, descripsit in *Τοῖς Ἰπποκράτους*—οὗτοι ὡς ὑαδεῖς τινὲς καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι ἐκαυμαδοῦντο, καὶ τάχ' ἂν ἦσαν προκίφαλοι τινες ὡς ἐν Γεωργοῖς φησὶ καὶ ἐν Τριφάλῃτι καὶ Εὐπολὶς Δήμοις, Ἰπποκράτους δὲ παῖδες ἐμβόλιμοι τινες βληχτὰ τέκνα καὶ οὐδαμῶς τοῦ τρόπου· τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, Τελέσιππος, Δημοφῶν, Περικλῆς. His quoque simillima Suid. iterum in *Ταδεῖς*, Comici tamen fabularum utriusque titulis omissis. Eupolidea emendat Kuster legendo τοῦ νῦν τρόπου collato Vesp. 996. at Toup. ad Suid. V. *Εμβόλιμοι*, prætulit τοῦμοῦ, collatis Thesm. 99. et 581. Sed neuter vidit *προκίφαλοι* esse mendosum. Scripsit Comicus *τρικέφαλοι*. Inde intelligas gl. Hesych. *Ἐγμῆς τρικέφαλος*. Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Τριφάλῃτι fuisse de Pericle dictam, qui jure poterat, si quis alius facundus, cum facundo Mercurio comparari.

Neque sane, ut id obiter moneam, hic locus est unicus, ubi *προκίφαλος* et *τρικέφαλος* confunduntur. Nempe in Av. 282. legitur *Ἐτερος αὖ λόφον κατειληφῶς τίς ὄρνις οὐτοσί; Τί τὸ τέρας τουτί ποτ' ἐστίν; οὐ σὺ μόνος ἄρ' ἦσθ' Ἐποψ*; At legi debet *λόφον*—*τρίς*: etenim hic volucris sicut Epops ipse, cujus *τριλογία* commemoratur in Av. 94. *τίς ὁ πρόπος τῆς τριλογίας*, fuit *κατειληφῶς λόφον τρίς*. Unde intelligitur illud οὐ σὺ μόνος ἄρ' ἦσθ' *Ἐποψ*; et legi debet *τρικέφαλος* in Schol. licet *προκίφαλος*—Suidas *ἔρpsa*

voce agnoscat. Exstat vox τρικέφαλος apud Lucian. Τοχαρ. 62. τοιοῦτόν τι γάρ ἐστι συνελθόντες δύο ἢ τρεῖς φίλοι, ὁποῖον τὸν Γηρύνην οἱ γραφεῖς ἐνδείκνυνται ἀνθρωπιν ἐξάχειρα καὶ τρικέφαλον. His præmissis, illico se prodit commendatque conjectura mea in Aristophanis fragmentum,

— ἡἀκεῖ τάχ' ἀν ἦσαν τρικέφαλοι·

B. τίνες ; A. Τελέσιππος, Δημοφῶν, καὶ Περικλῆς.
necnon in Eupolideum,

A. τοῦσδ' Ἴπποκράτους λέγ' υἱῶδι· B. ἐν βολίτῃ τίνες

βληχαί ; A. τὰ τέκνα κλυθ'· B. οἷδ' ἄρ' ἀμνοῦ τοὺς πρόπους.

In hoc etenim diverbio aliquis alterum, grunniū suū audito, unde clamor venerit, sciscitatur ; cui respondit alter, *hos quidem Hippocratis filiolos vel porcillos esse dixeris* ; et similiter de balatu ovium interrogantem edocet, agnello clamorem ciere.

Plane simillima est ratio fragmenti Theopompi apud Schol. ad Aristoph. Plut. 179. ubi, cum dixisset aliquis,

“Ὀνος μέγ' ἀγκᾶθ’—

alter respondit,

ὁ Μελιτεὺς Φιλωνίδης,

*Ὅς ὄναρ μιγείσης μητρὸς ἔβλαστ' ἐξ ὕδς :

ita enim legi debet. Fuit Melitensis Philonides derisus nomine κάπρος, teste Photio ; Μελιτέας κάπρον, Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Γήρᾳ λέγει ἀντι τοῦ ευκρατῆς· ἐπεὶ δασύς ἐστιν καὶ γὰρ ἄριστον αὐτὸν ἐλεγον : ubi ἄρκτον exhibet Hesych.

Suspicio igitur Photium scripsisse ΑΕΓΕΙ ΔΕ CTN ATTON Ὁ ΚΡΑΤΗΣ. Fuit is quidem Comicus : at alter fuit δρᾶνυμος Grammaticus, cujus nomen sæpe corrumpitur. Hoc perspectum habuit Valckenaer. Is enim ita scripsit in Not. Mss. ad Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 959. “ Pro οὕτω Σωκράτης legendum est οὕτως ὁ Κράτης : qui citatur a Schol. ad Ran. 296. Eq. 790. ubi Kuster in Auctorum Indice pro Κρατίνος reponendum Κράτης monuit : idem mendum in Etymol. p. 389, 18 : ubi citatur ὁ γραμματικὸς Σωκράτης. 6. male pro Κράτης cujus interpretationes Homericarum glossarum exstant apud Etymol. in Δι' ἀσπιδέος—Εξεμβολ—Μυλιόωντες—et Ὁρσοθήρη—Illius nomen vice Ἰσοκράτης Proclo restituit Grævius Lect. Hesiod. p. 67. Similiter in Schol. Apoll. Rh. i. 40. legi debet Κράτης vice Ἰσοκράτης : nisi quis malit Σωσικράτης qui Cretica conæcripsit citata ab Athen. p. 261. E. 263. F.” Ejusdem Socratis, ut id obiter moneam, mentio facta est in Zenob. v. 81. ubi vice Κρητικῶν legit Κρητικῶν Bentl. in Not. Mss. Photii gl. ita probe, ni fallor, emendata, redeo ad cætera Comicorum fragmenta, quæ scholia ad Plut. l. c. literis inandant, ita legenda, Νικοχάρης Γαλατεία· Ἠδὲν τ', ἀπαιδευτότερος ὢν Φιλωνίδου τοῦ Μελιτέως : et πικρ

Φιλύλλος φησιν—οὐ γυνή· Ἦν τις, κάμηλος δ' ἔτεκε τὸν Φιλωνίδην—καὶ Πλάτων δὲ Λαῖφ φησὶν—σύχ' ὄρεται, ὅτι Φιλωνίδην κάπρος τέτοχ', ἡ μήτηρ τ' ὄνος· Τὸν Μελιτέα; B. οὐκ ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν ἢ πόλις; quæ sane res pro sinistro fuit omine habenda. In Eupolideo fragmento Reisigius Conject. Aristoph. p. 112. primus vidit latere vocem υἱῆς: et tamen prætervidit lectionem genuinam ΔΕΓ ΤΗΔΙ latentem in ΔΕΠΑΙΔΑΣ. Εἰσὶν υἱδίων porcellum in Vesp 1347. Μοχ βληχῶν mentione facta, illico erui ἐν βολίτῳ ex ἐμβόλιμοι, necnon οἷδ' αἶρ' ἀμνοῦ τοὺς τρόπους ex οὐδαμῶς τοῦ τρόπου. Postrema quidem manifesto tuetur. Aristoph. Pac. 935. ἀμνοὶ τοὺς τρόπους. Adde et Plut. 1004. Τοὺς τρόπους—μοχθηρὸς et 1050. ἀκόλαστος—τοὺς τρόπους. Unde corrigas Pac. 790. legendo Ἀλλὰ νόμιζε πάντα Ὁρτυγας οἰκογενεῖς Γυλιαύχενας, ὀρχηστὰς Ἀμνοφυεῖς, σφυρά· ἀποκλύσματα vice Ναννοφυεῖς—ἀποκνίσματα. Etenim ἀπόκλυσμα significat idem fere atque ἀποκάθαρμα, et ἀποπάτημα; quorum ultimum optime convenit cum σφυράδων; neque minus opportune cum ἀμνοῦ mentione convenit et βόλιτος: quod proprie significat stercus bovium vel cujusvis animalis in præsepibus inclusi: cf. Eq. 655. ubi βόλιτος exponitur σπέλεθος τῶν βοῶν, et in Ach. 1025. ἐν πᾶσι βολίτοις Schol. ita, βόλιτος δὲ, ὅτι περὶ βοῶν ὁ λόγος: unde corrigas Schol. ad Ran. 927. βόλιτος γὰρ κυρίως τὸ τῶν ὄνων ἀποπάτημα legendo βοῶν et paulo ante βόειον vice ὄνειον, et similiter in Gregor. de Dial. p. 55=133. ex Aldino ἤγουν τὸ σκῆπτρον erui debet βοδὸς κόπρον. Vocem βόλιτα Cratino apud Schol. ad Aristoph. Lysistr. 575. restituit Porson. Advers. p. 284. legendo Οὐκ· ἀλλὰ βόλιτα χλωρὰ καὶ σπῶντην πατεῖν, eademque restitui debet Aristoph. Pac. 2. legendo Ἰδοὺ βολιτίην τῷ κάκιστ' ἀπολουμένῳ, Καὶ μήποτ' αὐτῆς μάζαν ἡδῖα φάγοι, vice Ἰδοὺ δὲ αὐτῶ: ubi manifesto abundat αὐτῶ: quod et Bentley vidit legendo αὐτὴν: manifesto quoque dici debuit, quale fuerit stercus primo datum illi σκατοφάγῳ scarabæo.

Hippocratis de grege porcos intelligit Scholiastes Telesippum, Demophonta et Periclem. Fuerunt et alii εἰς ὑγίαν διαβαλλόμενοι, teste Photio. Σῦς· ὅς τοὺς Ἰπποκράτους υἱοὺς ἔλεγον, καὶ τοὺς Παναιτίου καὶ Μέμνονος εἰς ὑγίαν κωμωδοῦντες. Unde corrigas eundem in V. Σαμιακὸν τρόπον· Κρατῖνος Ἀρχιλόχῳ εἰς ναμῖαν ἐπισκωπτῶν μιν· ναυσι γὰρ ἐμπερεῖς εἶχε τὰς πρῶρας τὰ τῶν Σαμίων πλοῖα, ὡς Χοιρίλοχος ὁ Σάμιος, legendo εἰς ὑγίαν ἐπισκώπτων Μέμνονος υἱῶ· ὑπὲρ γὰρ—Χοιρίλος. Ubi debetur ὑπὲρ nostro Dobræo.

REMARKS ON LIVY, iii, 5.

YOUR correspondent D. B. H. in No. XLVIII, p. 212. dissatisfied with my translation, and defence of the present reading of Livy iii, 5. (see No. XLVII, p. 29.) informs us of the general ambiguity of the ancient Mss. as to the words *cum* and *tum*, and in other instances: but does he find this obscurity in the Mss. of *Livy*? which should be shown, before he can have the option of substituting the one for the other.—His translation in No. XLVIII, p. 212. makes it erroneously appear that Quintius' arrival prevented the Consul and his army from being again besieged in camp: "Then the Romans driven back into their camp *should have been besieged* a second time, devoid of hope and inferior in strength to the enemy, and perilous had been," &c. —when the context shows that this *really* happened; and D. B. H. may read that a signal was made from the camp, to announce this disaster, on Quintius' approach—which confirms my version, "and were again suffering siege."

D. B. H., noticing my remark, "that *suis* joined with *peregrinis copiis* is nugatory and unworthy the historian," refers me to the preceding chapter but two, "Cum in fines suos se recepissent," &c. This reference is most unlucky for his argument; as a glance is enough to satisfy the most cursory reader, that *peregrinis copiis*, &c. conveys a clear idea, and the best sense, *without suis*. The English, "*with the foreign troops*," does the same, without the addition of *his*. On the contrary, in the expression, *Cum in fines suos*, &c. *suos* cannot be separated from *fines*, either in idea or translation. Wherever the *best* writers, as D. B. H. intimates, use the pronoun *suis* when it might be better omitted, they are faulty; but ere we entertain even the surmise of such a charge, the propriety of the omission must be clearly shown.

The opinion as to the corrupt state of this passage arises from the section "*quum compulsi*," &c. appearing out of place, as the conjunction *cum*, and its concomitant verb, are generally found at the beginning of a clause. But Livy, to preserve perspicuity, found no alternative but in transposition: for, though as to a part of the sense to be conveyed, "*quum compulsi*," &c. comes in far more intelligibly after *qui*;—Thus, "*qui, quum compulsi in castra Romani rursus obsiderentur nec spe nec viribus pares*;"—yet, *cade legati et consulis vulnere accensi*,

&c. following, the reader or hearer would be instantly arrested by the ambiguity as to *accensi*: whether it alluded to *Romani* or *hostes*. I had much rather agree with than differ from the learned authorities adduced by D. B. H.: but, after attentive reperusal, I still consider the common reading consistent and intelligible.—*Since I made the version*, I find I have the concurrent opinion of Drackenborch, who writes thus: *Ego in vulgata lectione nihil difficultatis video, modo ante vocem venissetque oratio majore distinctione interpungatur, &c.*

Permit me next to address a few observations to your learned Correspondent M., who has been pleased to notice my translation of this thorny passage; which he appears to approve generally, and joins me in opinion as to the inadmissibility of the changes of *tum* and *cum*, and again of *tum* into *suis*, proposed by D. B. H.—M. however is dissatisfied with my version of *unmolested* for *quietos*; but he has omitted to give us his own. As to the obvious contradiction which he thinks is involved in the application of the word *unmolested* to a besieged army, I have merely to reply—not a tittle more than there is in *quietos* of the original text: and therefore he may contend with Livy on that point.—The truth is, *quietos* and many other epithets are often relative in their meaning, and admit of great latitude in Ellipsis—M. himself has supplied a proper one, in the passage under notice. *Oppugnatione*, or *hostium impetu*, is naturally suggested by the context. But to be brief on this point, the version of “*unmolested*” is clearly supported by parallel passages of Livy and other authors. One passage to the point I cannot forbear quoting:

Ubi quum Volsci, quia nondum ab Æquis venisset exercitus, dimicare non ausi, quemadmodum *quieti* vallo se tutarentur pararent.—Liv. lib. 22.—which I would translate: Where when the Volsci, not daring to engage, as the forces from the Equi had not arrived, *were arranging* in what manner *unmolested* they might fortify themselves by a rampart.—Here too, after *quieti*, we must supply the ellipsis, “*ab hoste*,” or “*ab oppugnatione*,” and at once the mind is impressed with the idea “*unmolested*.”

But M. does not substitute any other version, and I cannot devise a better; therefore I proceed. I translated *Legatus* by Lieutenant, as the literal and accredited meaning of the word. I admit with Dr. Adam and with M., that the rank and duties of the “*Legatus*” in the Roman army are similar to those of our Lieutenant-General: but *we* attach the epithet General because there are with *us* subordinate Lieutenants; in the Roman mili-

tary nomenclature, all the Legati are of the same grade, and second in command in the army. I am, nevertheless, of opinion that, in versions from the Latin, it is better, in most instances, to anglicise the Roman terms. Thus, *Legatus*, Legate; Centurion for *Centurio*, &c.

M. objects to my expression (which by the way is not part of the translation), "durst not attack them:" he may, if he pleases, substitute, "did not attack them."—An army in campaign is subject to continual vicissitude. Let M. notice that which awaited the fortunes of the Consul and his enemy the Æqui, who, in the end, were totally routed. And this result, which M. ought to have read, altogether disproves his charge of cowardice against Furius; whose hopes of retrieving past disasters were not, as your correspondent states, *vain*; but, as the historian says, *realized*.

For "*And the Consul*" M. is of opinion I had better substitute "*The Consul also*." As indifferent as this small alteration may seem, it would lead the mind to erroneous anticipation. Thus, "*he fell while vigorously encountering the enemy*" immediately preceding "*The Consul also*," the mistaken notion would be excited in the reader's mind, that something like a similar fate *was about to be told of him*.

It appears to me, after revision of this passage, that *et* in Latin, like *δέ* in the Greek with its adjunct *μεν*, is sometimes solely indicative of the emphasis or antithesis on the words before which this particle stands.

"*Et Consul*" is in antithesis with *Furium Legatum*, in the preceding sentence.—The English would clearly read better without my "and" or M.'s "*also*."

"*Resolved upon battle*" (my version for *conversus ad pugnam*), is termed a "singularly erroneous interpretation;" for M. imagines it would be inferred that "such an idea had for the first time entered into the mind of the Consul." I should consider such conclusion unwarrantable. In the checkered fortune of war, a General may be said to *have resolved upon battle*; but such expression by no means justifies the inference, *that no fight has recently taken place*.

It cannot be said that the Consul "*returned to the fight*," as M. would amend the translation; for he *had not retreated*. We are told a few lines above, that he had merely *halted*, *substitit*. Let Livy explain *himself*.—The verb *converto* with the preposition *ad*, as in the sentence under notice, is used in the following extracts, in the meaning of *to fix the mind upon*, *to resolve or determine*. "Ad crudelem superbamque vim animum conver-

tit :” lib. iii, 44. “Animum ad agrōs colendum convertere :” lib. i, 25. “Animum ad negotia urbana convertere :” lib. i, 25. Numerous other instances may be quoted. “Nuncio circumventi fratris conversus ad pugnam,” or, according to another excellent reading, “ad pugnandum ;” supplying after “conversus” the ellipsis *animo* or *animum*, we may translate, *ad literam*, “On the message of his brother being surrounded, *having decided on attack*,” &c. In the ancient Mss., where there is no distinction of words, the substantive in the accusative, and the particle, thus, PUGNAMDUM, and the gerund of Pugno, thus, PUGNANDUM, might by copyists have been easily taken for each other. Some manuscripts show the latter ; but without such authority the reading might be adopted, if it would mend the passage. Yet, as I have asserted, (which I did without having seen Drackenborch’s corroborative opinion,) the common reading is quite intelligible. If the passage be susceptible of improvement, I am inclined to think this might be effected by reading “ad pugnandum.” The version of the clause would then be, “On the message of his brother being surrounded, *having decided on attack, he throws himself with more temerity than caution into the midst of the conflict ; being wounded, he was with difficulty rescued by his soldiers around him*,” &c. The improvement is both in the elucidation of the meaning of the historian, and the latinity. By this reading some ambiguity is removed ; inasmuch as “*ad pugnam*” leaves us in doubt whether to understand the fight *in which* part of the Consul’s forces were engaged while he was halting, or the attack he himself was about to make with his own division : whereas “*ad pugnandum*” limits the meaning to the evident fact ; it also clears the passage of *dum* as a particle, which is better out of the way. “*Dum infert*” by the construction should be accompanied by another verb in the same tense, which does not appear ; add to this, the narration proceeds with more of the true Livian rapidity, accordant to the eventful crisis. And all this, let it be noted, is effected by the omission of a *single stroke of a letter in the ancient Mss.*—a justifiable emendation. M.’s version of “*more determined*,” “*more confident*,” is very well for *ferociores* : but our language does not furnish a single word sufficiently strong for *ferox* ; the same may be said of *atrox* ; unless indeed by the same words anglicised, as they are in *ferocious* and *atrocious* : an ὁμοιοφωνία seems intended in the termination *or*, indicative of violence, shock, and tumult. The original idea of *ferox* seems to be *terrible in action* ; of *atrox*, *terrible in appearance* ; the former plainly derivable (as many other Latin words are) from the He-

brew verb פָּרַץ *farāj* or *fārāz*, “to break through,” or “rush with violence,” making in the infinitive פָּרוֹץ *farōj* or *fārōz*. In the imperative it is precisely the Latin *ferox*, פִּירוֹץ *fērōz*, the first vowel extremely short. The *ʿ* in Hebrew, and the *x* as it is this day sounded by the Spaniards and Portuguese, and very probably was by the Romans of old, being uttered with the strong emission of the *j* by the French in *jolie*; for this sound gives the very ὁμοιοφωνία indicative, either simply or metaphorically, of all the meanings in which we see both the Hebrew פָּרוֹץ and the Latin *ferox* applied.

The colon after “*viribus pares*,” which I recommended to be placed there instead of D. B. H.’s comma, was suggested by mere attention to the subject, before I saw Drakenborch’s text, for which no kind of merit is claimed; though I am happy in coinciding with this learned editor in that punctuation.

I thank M. for his emendation in the placing a comma, instead of colon, before the words, “When the Romans driven back, &c.” M. says, “J. W. seems evidently to have imagined that the obscurity in Livy’s language was to be obviated by the nice construction of the verb *obsiderentur*, which he renders, ‘were again suffering siege;’ but it was incumbent on him to point out the possibility of understanding the word in a different sense, which, if I am not greatly mistaken, he would have found no trivial ‘*onus probandi*.’” This observation I do not understand; and am ready to suppose there is either a misprint, or that your correspondent meant to write *impossibility*. For, *levissimum sane est onus probandi*; or rather it is self-apparent, that *obsiderentur*, &c. have been and are taken in a different sense by D. B. H., M., and others. My department is to point out, that these words must be confined to the meaning only in which numbers with myself have accurately translated them by “were again suffering siege.”

Verbs in the tense of *obsiderentur* ever denote *incipient*, progressive, indeterminate, or connected action or passion. To establish this rule, let Phædrus take the lead:

Athenæ quum florereut æquis legibus :

When Athens was flourishing, &c. This happy state was not momentaneous and gone, for *during this*

Procax libertas civitatem miscuit.

Again, Uxorem quondam Sol quum vellet ducere :

Once on a time when Sol had a mind to marry, it was *during*, and in progress of this inclination, that

“Clamorem Ranae sustulere ad sidera.

Next, Os devoratum fauce *glum* hæreret Lupi:
As a bone had been devoured, *and was sticking in the Wolf's*
throat, *it was during the suffering that*

Magno dolore victus cœpit singulos

Illicere pretiis, &c.

Now for Cicero, in his beautifully descriptive epistle: "*Ex Asia rediens cum ab Ægina Megaram versus navigarem*"—On my return out of Asia, *while I was sailing from Ægina towards Megara*, "*post me erat Ægina, ante Megara*," &c.

But an entire Number of your Journal, Mr. Editor, might be covered with evidence that "*quum compulsi in castra Romani rursus obsiderentur*" is correctly translated, "*when the Romans driven back into their camp were again suffering siege.*"

The adverb *deinde* is quite in its place, and, in my opinion, unattended with any obscurity.—It may be literally translated *henceforth*: that is—after the death of the Legate, and the wound of the Consul.

Sustineo has its common meaning; it is quasi, *meipsum teneo sub irruentem aliquem*.—There may be a "*parallel*" meaning to the Greek verbs *στέγω* and *ἀποστέγω*; but Dr. Blomfield on revisal of his Glossary will desire to be not only parallel but *on the line of truth*, and may perhaps improve it by giving us the manifest meaning of *arceo* or *inhibeo*, *defendo* or *propulso*.

Thus, *Δυσμενέων δ' ὄχλον Πύργος ἀποστέγοι*, of Æschylus S. c. Th., *Hostium multitudinem Turris propulset*. This sublime Tragedian abounds in Oriental metaphors and Hebraisms. *Πύργος* is *personified*, and is a close resemblance to the 3d verse of the 61st Psalm, in which David compares the Almighty to a "*Tower of strength*,"¹ *יְהוָה כְּמִצְדָּה*, translated by the Septuaginta *πύργος ισχύος*. A similar instance of the personification of *Πύργος* occurs in the CEd. Tyr. of Sophocles vs. 1198.

Ω Ζεῦ κατὰ μὲν φθίσας τὰν γαμφύωνυκα

Παρθένον χρησµωδόν·

Θανάτων δ' ἐμὰ χώρα Πύργος ἀνέστας· κ. τ. λ.

As to the favorite phrase of Livy, "*summa rerum*," it may appear vague; it is nevertheless with the context always intelligible. The expression in English which comes nearest to it, and is the most literal version, is "*most important interests*," "*best interests*," "*dearest interests*," which will suit almost every passage. Thus "*Consilia populi, exercitus vocati, summa rerum*,"

¹ For thou hast been a shelter for me, and a strong Tower from the enemy.

ubi aves non admisissent, dirimerentur." Liv. 1. 36. The decrees of the people, armies called out, their dearest interests might be disturbed unless the birds had given sanction. In the other sentence which M. has quoted, "ut summæ rerum prosperum eventum, ita haud sane incruentam ancipitisque certaminis victoriam, Romanis portendit:" As it portended an event favorable to the dearest interests of the Romans, so (*it foretold*) a victory by no means bloodless, and after a doubtful contest.

J. W.

Liverpool, 1st March, 1822.

PROLUSIO EPIGRAPHICA

de Inscriptione Græca in Museo Britannico asservata,

AUCTORE FRID. OSANN, PROFESSORE JENENSI.

SPECIMINIS loco commentationem hanc edo, qua operi lapidario, intra breve temporis spatium edendo, atque ita inscripto,

*Sylloge Inscriptionum antiquarum Græcarum et
Latinarum, quas in Itineribus suis per Italiam,
Galliam, et Britanniam factis exscripsit par-
timque nunc primum edidit F. Osann,*

bono omine præcludere volui. Corpus hoc inscriptionum per singulos fasciculos, quorum primus, quum verba hæc legeris, in lucem dudum emissus erit, quibus membris comprehensum sit, etsi in Germania *Prospectu* operis ampliori ex tabernis librariorum gratis distribuendo satis constat, tamen inter exterarum nationum doctos indoctosque quum prævideam non defore, quibus gratum atque acceptum hoc syntagma titulorum antiquorum sit, ex re tam aliorum quam mea esse putavi, si opportunitate hac oblata usus, de ratione *Sylloges* hujus, quam *Prospectu Germanice conscripto* accurate explanavi, in transcurso hic præfarer. Titulorum, quos, si paucos excipis, omnes in itinere quatuor his abhinc annis instituto ipse exscripsi, *Sylloge* in quinque Sectiones dividi commode posse visa est, quarum

Prima Marmora Elginia vulgo dicta, cum aliis in Britannia servatis;

Secunda Fourmontiorum nec non aliorum in Museo Regio Parisiensi exstantium partem;

Tertia Muscorum Romanorum, Vaticani maxime et Capitolini;

Quarta Florentinorum; et

Quinta aliarum Italiæ urbium, uti Neapolis, Venetiarum, Mediolani, etc., et Helvetiæ lapides continet.

Hoc opus, quod ut pluribus commendem apud Viros doctos haud opus credo, Jenæ, ubi impensa mea et cura typis exaratur, in libraria Cræckeria, Londini apud Bohte (4, York Street, Covent Garden), Parisiis apud Treuttel et Würtz, nec non aliis urbibus Europæ terrarum primariis prostat.

Titulus, qui primum hic editur, ex eorum Elginiorum est, quos Auctor *Synopseos of the Contents of the British Museum*, London, 1818. pag. 132. monet esse *so imperfect as scarcely to admit of particular description*. Numerabatur, quum anno 1818. describerem, CXCIII.

HP
AΘ
ΕΓΕ
ΜΟΣΑΝ
ΙΣΗΓΕΙΞ
ΗΣΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ
ΧΛΙΔΩΝΧΡΥΣΙΑΕΧ
ΚΙΒΩΤΙΟΝΣΕΣΗΜΑΣΜ

Inscriptionis hujus, quovis latere misere mutilæ, etsi de argumento difficile est certi quid statuere, tamen donariorum consecrationem vel indicem ea contineri, et χλιδῶν et κιβώτιον, quæ manifeste eruas, perspicue docere videntur. Verba tamen ΤΗΣ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗΣ vs. 6. quid sibi velint, assequi non magis potui, quam cujusnam templi dona hæc sint, in marmore memorata. In ætatem tituli e forma litterarum conjecturam facere licet, qua eum haud longe post Euclidem archontem (Olymp. 94.) conceptum fuisse, probabile admodum fit: id quod præsertim e forma litteræ Ξ demonstrari potest.

Adnotatio.

Vs. 2. Athenæ nomen latere videtur, et mox vs. 4. ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ, præeunte nomine viri vel feminæ consecrantis in ΜΟΣ terminato.

Vs. 5. Quum nihil obstet quominus hoc donariorum indice ea omnia dona, quæ plures per annos pia mente templo oblata sint, recensita esse putemus, id quod factum videmus, in alio

titulo Elginio *Sylloges nostræ Sect. I. No. X.*,¹ in quo præmisso uniuscujusque archontis nomine ea omnia tum memorantur dona, quæ cujusque archontatu oblata sint: haud male mihi videor suspicari, litteris ΕΠΙΕ initium novi archontatus significari, atque quum unius tantummodo Atheniensium archontis nomen a littera Ι incipiat, scilicet Xenæneti, suo munere annuo post Euclidem functi—nam Xenippi archontis nomen e Fastis Atticis Corsinus Fast. Att. T. 4. p. 68. seq. bene delevit—supplendum fere esse ΕΠΙΕΝΑΙΝΕΤΟΥΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ. At certo hæc, scio, pede non incedunt.

Vs. 7. A fine supple ΕΧΩΝ, pone quam vocem numerus, quot in χλιδῶνι fuerint χρυσία, excidit. Χλιδῶν iisdem fere verbis inter donaria templo consecrata in alio titulo, quem ex Chandleri Inscr. Antiq. P. II. No. IV, 2. vs. 33. p. 54. Aug. Bæckhius *Staatshaus haltung der Athener*, Tab. v. No. xii, 6. accuratius edidit, memoratur, χλιδῶν χρυσία ἔχων Δ. Χλιδῶν autem quid sit, Phavorinus p. 1867, 35. ed. Basil. bene his docet: Χλιδῶνες, κόσμοι ὧν αἱ γυναῖκες περὶ τοῖς βραχίσιον εἰώθασιν φορεῖν καὶ τοὺς τραχύλους [lege τοῖς τραχήλοις.] Inter ornamenta muliebria etiam alii χλιδῶνα referunt, veluti Hesychius h. v. Pollux 7, 93. Idem 5, 99. bene addit vocem etiam de *pedum armillis* dici, quod vox χλιδωνόπους confirmat. Cf. Winckelmanni Opp. omn. ed. Meyeri, T. 5. p. 57. Plura de h. v. dabit Schneiderus Lex. Græc. ed. novæ. Quonam autem modo χλιδῶν χρυσία ἔχων explicandus sit, non ita facile liquet. Bæckhius l. c. T. 2. p. 309. vernaculo sermone interpretatus est *eine Spange mit zehn Goldstückchen*, vereor, ut recte, si quidem v. *Goldstückchen* numos aureos intellexit. Vocem enim χρυσίον etsi negari non potest de *pecunia numerata* subinde dici, quod annotarunt Sturzius Lex. Xenophonteo h. v. T. 4. et Reiskius Indice Æschinis h. v. p. 1214., tamen quum idem Bæckhius alio sui operis loco, pag. 213. T. 2., bene monuerit, ἀργύριον et χρυσίον etiam de *argento* et *auro* nondum percusso dici, hanc potius significationem vocis hic prætulerim, quum præsertim massas artificiose elaboratas intelligis, veluti globulos in rosarum vel nescio quam aliam formam figuratos, quibus armillæ exornari solebant. V. Caylus *Recueil d'Antiquités*, T. 5. tab. 93.

Vs. 8. Κιβώτιον de quavis maxime *ligna cista*, in qua siccum quodvis condatur, dictum inprimis inter dona memoratur sacro vovenda. V. titulum e schedis Bæckhii a Carolo Ottofrido

¹ Opera pretium videtur hanc inscriptionem memorabilem in Ægina insula repertam hinc repetere :

ΙΙΩΙ : II : ΑΛΥ
 _Ε : II : ΣΙΔΗΡΙΑΕΙΟΥΓΗΣ : IIII :
 ΚΑΡΚΙΝΩ : II : ΪΥΛΙΝΑΤΑ
 ΔΕΞΑΛΕΙΓΤΡΟΝ : I : ΚΙΒ
 ΩΤΟΙ : III : ΙΚΡΙΑΓΕΡΙΤΟΕ
 ΔΟΣΕΝΤΕΛΗΘΡΟΝΟΣ : I :
 ΔΙΦΡΟΣ : I ΒΑΘΡΑ : IIII : ΘΡΟΝ
 ΟΣΜΙΚΡΟΣ I : ΚΛΙΝΗ : ΣΜΙ
 ΚΡΑ : I : ΒΑΘΡΟΝΑΝΑΚΛΙΣ
 ΙΝΕΧΟΝ. I ΚΙΒΩΤΙΑΜΙΚ
 ΑΡΑ : III ΒΑΘΡΟΝΥΓΟΚΡΑΤ
 ΪΡΙΟΝ ΚΙΒΩΤΙΟΝΓΛΑ
 ΤΥ : I : ΕΝΤΩΙΑΜΦΙΓΟΛΕΙ
 ΩΙΤΑΔΕΧΑΛΚΙΟΝΘΕΡΜ
 ΑΝΘΗΡΙΟΝ : I : ΧΕΡΟΝΙΓΤ
 ΡΟΝ : I : ΦΙΑΛΑ : II : ΓΕΛΕΚΥΣ : I :
 ΑΧΧΛΟΣ : I : ΜΑΧΑΙΡΙΑ : III :
 ΚΛΙΝΑ : II : ΧΑΛΚΙΟΝΕΓ
 ΛΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ : I : ΑΡΥΣΤΙΧΟ
 Σ : I : ΗΟΜΟΣ : I :

Heinsii. Utar hac vocis mentione ad tentandum vitiosum Evagrii locum, qui ita in *Historia Ecclesiast.* 2, 3. p. 287. ed. Mogunt. fertur: *Ἐνθα τὰ πανάγια τοῦ μάρτυρος ἀπόκειται λείψανα ἐν τινι σορῶ τῶν ἐπιμήκων, μακρὰν ἔνιοι καλοῦσιν.* Valckenarius *Animadv.* ad *Ammon.* 2, 19. p. 155. de mendo in v. *μακρὰν* recte suspicans, non idem recte id *λέvasse* videtur, quum *μάνδραν* conjiceret. Equidem hoc loco Evagrium crediderim ad Latinam rei appellationem alludere, quæ hinc etiam in Græcam linguam transiit, *arca*: quare *ἄρκαν* correxerim. Aliud enim quid sonat vox *μάνδρα*, quam ut hic recte locum habere possit: cf. Hesych. v. *Κάρκαρα*, T. 2. p. 150. Toupii *Emend.* in *Suidam* T. 2. p. 137. ed. Oxon. *Philemon. Lex. Technol.* 181. p. 66. *Sophocles fragm.* *Tyrus* xv, 3. (apud *Ælian. H. Animal.* 12, 16.) In *Schol. Nicandri Theriac.* 211. *Ἐπειδὴ ξηραίνει τὸ δηλητήριον, τὰ δὲ οὐλα τῶν ὀδόντων ἐκ βάθρων ῥήγνυται, lege ἐκ μανδρῶν ῥήγνυται.* Inter *Glossas Isidori* p. 4. et *Pithæanas* p. 52. ed. *Godofredi* editur, *ARLÆ, mortuorum pulvinaria*, ubi reponas mecum *arca*.¹

ΣΕΣΗΜΑΣΜΕΝΟΝ, quod in titulo sequitur, positum pro *ἐσφραγισμένον*: qua significatione vox apud *Demosth.* in *Bæotum* p. 999, 16. *Reisk.* *Εἰ μὴ σεσημασμένων ἤδη συνέβη τῶν ἐχίνων*, et *Dinarchum* exstat, teste *Harpocrate* pag. 160. ed. *Gronov.* ubi corrige *σεσημασμένων*—*ἐσφραγισμένων*, eo ducente lectione codicis *Darmstadiensis* in *Thierschii Act. Philol. Monac.* vol. 3. fasc. 4. p. 268. excerpta. Adde tituli inediti fragmentum nuper publici juris factum a *Bæcklio* *Indice Lectionum in Universitate Litt. Berolinensi per semestr. æstiv. 1817, habendum*, p. 5. *Καὶ [οἱ ταμίαι τῶν θεῶν] συνανοιγόντων καὶ συγκλείοντων τὰς θύρας τοῦ ὀπισθοδόμου καὶ συσσημαινέσθων τοῖς τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας ταμίαις.*

Dabam Jenæ ipsis Calendis

m. Junii, C1D1CCCCXXII.

¹ Propinavimus hæc verba ex opere typis mox describendo, *Auctario observationum Lexicis Græcis, præcipue H. Stephani Thesouro Linguae Græcæ, augendis corrigendisve scriptarum*: in quo, ne de aliis accessionibus dicam, *H. Stephani Thesouro* aliquot vocabulorum millia e scriptis tam editis quam ineditis collecta addentur.

NUGÆ.

No. V.—[Continued from No. 51. p. 82.]

collecting toys
And trifles for choice matters, worth a sponge ;
As children gathering pebbles¹ on the shore.
Paradise Regained, IV. 325.

CRITICS on modern Latin are sometimes in danger of mistaking a genuine ancient phrase for a modernism. The above remark was suggested to us by the following passage, among many others occurring in different authors :

———— Egressæ thalamis Scyreïdes *ibant*
Ostentare choros promissaque sacra verendis
Hospitibus. Stat. Achill. II. 146.

Had this occurred in a modern Latin poet of our own country, it would have been denounced by some as an Anglicism, only less barbarous than the inscription on the famous Lord Talbot's sword, " Sum ensis Talboti ; *pro vincere inimicos meos.*" Again, in the same passage :

Ut leo, materno quum raptus ab ubere mores
Accepit, pectique jubas, hominemque vereri
Edidicit, nullasque ruit nisi jussus in iras.

Ib. 183.

Anglice, " has learnt manners." Perhaps too the following lines, from the same book, might have been charged with false Latin, though for a different reason :

Ast ego *vel* primæ puerilis fabula culpæ
Narrabor famulis, aut dissimulata tacebo :

Ib. 272.

(if indeed the reading be correct.)

The following verses, from Polybius, may be added as a supplement to those collected from the earlier Greek Authors by Cæcilius Metellus in former numbers of the Journal. They are but a few of the instances contained in Polybius, and are to be attributed to his general carelessness as a writer.

Καὶ ταῖς σωφροσύναις, καὶ ταῖς τόλμαις ἀπέβησαν—
Reliq. Lib. VIII. 12.
Θουκυδίδης ἀπέλιπε, καὶ συνεγγίσας—Ib. 13.

¹ Ed. princeps, " pibles."

καιροῖς ἐδυσχρηστοῦντο τῶν ἡττωμένων. 1x. 3.

οὕτω γὰρ ἂν

μόνως δύναίτο συμμετρεῖσθαι πρὸς λόγον—Ib. 15.

Ἄρατος ἢ Χρυσόγονος, ἡμερώτατος. Ib. 23, ult.

καὶ πρῶτον εἰς ὕπαιθρον ἐξεληλυθὼς—X. 3.

σύρρουν γεγονέναι χειροποιήτως, χάριν—Ib. 10.

σύνταγμα διελὼν, τοὺς μὲν ἡμίσεις ἐπὶ—Ib. 12.

νῦν πρῶτον, οὐδὲ δεύτερον, ποιούμεθα—x1. 5.

καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, δύο γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ τότε—Ib. 18.

Two also occur in a quotation from Theopompus in viii. 11.

κύβοις, ἐτίμα καὶ προσῆγε. τοιγαροῦν—

Πήλιον ἔχοντας, οὔτε τοὺς Λαιστρυγόνας—(reading of Suidas.)

The Quarterly Reviewer (No. LIII. Art. Camoens) is severe on a passage in the *Lusiad*, where Venus and the sea-nymphs are introduced as interfering to preserve Vasco de Gama's fleet from a reef of rocks, the goddess herself "setting them the example, by putting her breast against the prow of Gama's vessel, and in that manner shoving it off." This *bêtise*, however, seems to be only a perversion of the passage in Virgil, where Cymodoce and the other transformed nymphs meet the fleet of Æneas :

Dixerat, et dextra discedens impulit altam,

Haud ignara modi, puppim : fugit illa per undas

Ocior et jaculo et ventos æquante sagitta.

Inde aliæ celerant cursus.

Æn. v. 246.

In the ingenious dissertation on the Æolic digamma, in the same Number, the critic has omitted to notice (p. 61.) that the instances of *hiatus* in Virgil are more especially confined to words derived from the Greek, as in two of the instances which he has quoted from the first-mentioned poet, "*Ἄλωα* [read *Ἑωα*] *Atlantides*," and "*Νεπτῦνο Ἄεγαο*." We forbear to multiply instances, of which Virgil is full. So in the later Latin writers, who in other cases were remarkably sparing of the hiatus :

Et Cyane, et Anapus, et Ortygie Arethusa. ~ Sil. Ital. xiv.

We may take this opportunity of quoting the only instance of the kind which occurs in Claudian :

Hæ sacris animata Numæ : huic fulmina vibrat

Jupiter.

De Laud. Stilich. iii. 167.

In the same poem also a solitary instance occurs of the lengthening a short syllable on the score of *cæsura* :

Illius ut Phœbus ad limen constitit antri.

ii. 441.

Now that we are criticising the critics, we cannot help noticing a trivial error of a writer in the Monthly Censor, No. I., who, in reviewing a work on the Ionian Islands, chastises

the author for writing the name of a Cephallenian town three different ways, and all wrong. It is singular that the reviewer himself should, after all, be mistaken in the orthography: he corrects *Palæ*—the true name is Palé. The historical discoveries which the critic quotes from his author, relative to the exploits of the Cephallenians in the Peloponnesian war previous to the siege of Troy, are not, as he supposes, unparalleled: we have read, in a popular collection of anecdotes, of the arrest of a thousand Achæans by a Roman Prætor, on suspicion of a conspiracy to betray their country into the hands of the king of Persia; and the writer of a work intended for the use of schools, after mention of the disasters incurred by Athens in the Peloponnesian war, subjoins, that the Athenians were amply avenged by their general Epaminondas, who carried fire and sword to the very walls of Sparta. Philip of Macedon (or we are misinformed) has been severely censured by a modern political writer for his interference in the Peloponnesian war; and old Lilly has an anecdote respecting the same monarch (Euphues, p. 77-8.): “I have heard of Themistocles, which having offended Philip the king of Macedonia, and could in no way appease his anger, meeting his young son Alexander, took him in his arms, and met Philip in the face (qu. ἐν ὄμμασι); Philip, seeing the smiling countenance of the child, was well pleased with Themistocles.” Nor is this wonderful, if, as Pope reports in the proœmium to one of his satires on Curll, (where he seems to have had some curious passages of this sort in view,) the same Themistocles, for a bribe, “let in the Goths and Vandals into Carthage, whereby they most barbarously put out the other eye of the famous Hannibal; as Herodotus hath it in his ninth book of Roman Feasts and Festivals.”

Where are the following words of Plutarch to be found? Οὐχ ἥττον δὲ σεμνὸν ἀκούσαι γαμετῆς λεγούσης, “*Ἄνερ, σύ μοι ἔσσι καθηγητῆς καὶ φιλόσοφος καὶ διδάσκαλος τῶν καλλίστων καὶ θειοτάτων*,” We notice them as the origin of Pope’s line,

Thou wert my guide, philosopher, and friend.

IN EURIPIDEI PHAETHONTIS FRAG- MENTA NOTÆ. G. B.

IN *Cl. Jl.* No. XLIII. p. 156—171. exstant a me primum edita duo Euripidei Phaethontis Fragmenta, cum Annotationibus subjectis. Fragmenta eadem nuper edidit et Godofredus Hermannus, notasque addidit in Dissertatione Lipsiensi solenniter scripta, quæ typis iterum nuperrime vulgatur, meis quoque annotationibus adjectis, in *Miscellan. Critic. Hildesiensibus*, T. 1. Part. 1. Vereor igitur ne supervacaneum aliquid facere videar, fragmenta illa denuo tractaturus. Inest tamen in Hermanni dictis, quod non tam mei quam Hermanni causa, leniter animadverti debet. Poteram equidem gravius aliquid in Hermannum ingerere; verum consulto me ab isto scribendi more abstinui, unde nihil nisi dedecus in literas humaniores reportari solet.

Hermanni verba sunt, “Burgesium unde fragmenta ista acceperit, non dixit. A Bekkero tamen accepisse puto, si quidem non nisi in paucissimis aliam scripturam, quam Bekkerus, exhibuit.”

Egregia profecto est Hermanni hæcce conjectura, et, quo nomine vereor ne non pleræque suspiciones Hermanni possint appellari, verissima. Ipse etenim palam dixi fragmenta esse ab Immanuele Bekkero descripta; etsi non aperte dixi me fragmenta a Bekkero per Dobræum accepisse.

Iterum, iudice Hermannno, “fragmenta illa Burgesium conjecturis non multum profici videntur.”

Atqui Hermannus ipse ter meas conjecturas comprobat, totidemque meas pro suis venditat, et bis meas Bekkero tribuit. Jure igitur optimo statuit Hermannus “Burgesium perpauca attulisse, quibus uti quis possit.” Dolere scilicet Hermannus videtur sibi non licere meis conjecturis sæpius uti, seu, rectius ut dicam, abuti.

Verum enimvero quantum aut quantillum de me profecerit Hermannus, non ambitiose persequar: neque verbis Hermanni meos labores vilipendentis respondere volo. Istis jam satis responsum est ab Hildesiensibus Editoribus, Hermanni convicia iterare nolentibus, utpote falsa, aut certe literis Græcis nihil profutura.

Licet Bekkerus ipse maximam in partem felicissime se

expedierit e scriptura Codicis quam intricatissima, vestigia tamen aliquoties literarum, quas MS. exhibet, deserere videtur. Id abunde liquet ex Apographis duobus Haseanis penes Hernannum, e quibus alterum amice conspirat cum apographo tertio, quod Dobræi amicus in usum Porsoni quondam descripsit. Hinc evenit, ut ipse deceptus aliquantisper, facerem conjecturas, quas omittere debui, quas vero facere debui, ut omitterem. Utrumque erratum nunc demum corrigere volo et possum, ope variarum lectionum, quas singulaquæque ex illis quinque jam commemoratis apographis exhibent; *e quibus duo Bekkeriana notantur B. 1. 2. Haseana duo, H. 1. 2. at D. illud penes Dobræum.

2. B. 1. 2. ΠΕΡΑ ΓΑΡ ΟΥ ΘΕΜΙΣ. At H. 1. 2. ΠΕΡΑ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΚ ΑΙΑΙ. Inde erue ΠΕΡΑ ΓΑΡ ΟΥΚ ΕΑΙ. De εἰς *perimittit* alibi depravato vid. mea in *Cl. Jl.* No. XLIV. p. 37. et No. XLVII. p. 125. et ad Tro. 323. ubi Thucydides, Euripides, et Sophocles emendantur. Emendari quoque debet Demosth. de Coron. p. 147. §. 122. legendo εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ ἐχρῆν ἀλλὰ — τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἅπασαν ὀφθῆναι ζώντων Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἐώντων vice οὐσαν—όντων : ubi Valckenaer in Not. MSS. penes Dobræum legebat ἰδόντων : quod tueri poterunt mea ad Æsch. Eum. 265. sed ἐώντων mirifice confirmat conjectura Porsoni ad Toup. iv. p. 461. legentis ἐώντων vice ζώντων in Eurip. Suppl. 232. ubi citare poterat Demosth. p. 143. §. 96. τῶν νόμων οὐκ ἐώντων, et Isæi verba p. 80. νόμος οὐκ ἔξ, necnon Iph. A. 892. Οὐκ ἐὼν ἢ συγκελεύων.

3. B. 1. 2. τυγχάνης ε... Unde ipse olim conjeci ἐτήτυμος, collato Soph. Trach. 1064. παῖς ἐτήτυμος γεγώς. Hanc meam conjecturam Bekkero tribuit Hermannus. Verum H. 1. 2. ΙΤΙΧΑΛΗΔ ΩΝ. Unde erui potest τυγχάνης τι ΤΩΝ ΑΙΤΩΝ. Hermannus edidit σάφ' ἴσθ' ὅτι.

5. B. 1. 2. δωμα θερμον ηλιου. H. 1. 2. ΔΩΜΑΘΕΜΟΝ-ΝΑΙΟΥ. Ibi latet ΔΩΜ ΑΘΝΟΟ ΗΛΙΟΥ. Certe postulatur aliquid cum βλάπτειν per antithesin conventurum.

7. B. 1. 2. ^{ειπερ} επει πατηρ πεφυκεν ου καλως λεγεις. Inde erui *ειπερ* — πέφυκε κοῦκ ἄλλως — probante Hermannus. • At H. 1. 2. ΕΠΕΙ ΤΑΣΙΠΠΕΦΤΝΟΤΚΑΚΩΣΑΕΙΠΙ. Unde confirmatur Elmslei conjectura οὐ κακῶς —

8. H. 1. ΑΥΤΟΤΕΧΡΟΝΩ. H. 2. sine T. In utroque C mutatur in O. B. 1. 2. αυτο τω χρονω. In MS. fortasse olim fuit αυτο συν χρονω. Similiter in Med. 882. MSS. vetustiores ἀλλὰ νῦν χρόνῳ : recentiores τῷ : quod in Rom. A. e 2da. manu

exstat pro var. lect. Porsonus ipse vult ἀλλὰ σὺν χρόνῳ: cui favet Trach. 202. Adi quoque Lobeck. ad Ajac. p. 443. legitur tamen ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ ποτε in Soph. El. 1013. Elmsleius quidem intelligit ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ tandem aliquando, monetque idem valere ἀλλὰ νῦν. Verum ἀλλὰ νῦν tempus præsens, ἀλλὰ τῷ χρόνῳ futurum significat.

9. B. 1. 2. ἀρκεῖ πεποιθα γὰρ σε μὴ ψευδῇ λεγεῖν. H. 1. 2. ΑΡΚΕΙ ΠΕΠΟΙΜΑΙΑΙCΕΜΗΨΕΥΔΗΛΕΙΝ. Inde debet erui Ἄρκεϊ πέπεισμαι ἄλλῃς σὲ μὴ ψευδῇ νοεῖν. Verane an falsa mater diceret pro certo Phæthon habere non potuit; potuit quidem pro certo habere eam nihil falsum meditari.

Quod ad Crasin in α, α, vid. mea ad Æsch. Eum. 939.

Quod ad sententiam, cf. Nicomach. in Grot. Exc. p. 885. Οὕτως πέπεισμαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ μὴ λάλει.

10. B. 1. 2. καὶ γὰρ αἰδ' ἐξω δομῶν. H. 1. 2. ΚΑΙΠΑΙΑΑΝΑΜ. Ibi latet fortasse καὶ γὰρ Αἰ' ΚΑΤΩ ΠΕΛᾶΝ. Et enim Chori adventus jam e longinquo per clamorem significabatur.

11. B. 1. 2. αἱ πατρὸς . . τὰς γαμοὺς. H. 1. 2. ΑΙΠΑΤΡΟCΤΟΙΑΩΡΙΜΟΙ. Hermianus inde eruit ΚΟΙΜΩΜΕΝΟΙ. Mihi vero placet, ob illud σαιρωσι, eruere ΙΝΑ ΙΑΤΡΕΙC ΚΟΡΗΜΑCΙ σάιρωσι. Hujusmodi res domesticas in scenam inferre consueverat Euripides, ab Aristophane idcirco derisus; qui perquam opportune servavit, ni fallor, Euripideum in Pac. 58. Καὶ φησὶν, ὦ Ζεῦ, τί ποτε βουλεύου ποιεῖν; Τὸ κῆρυμα κατάθου' μὴ ἔκκορρει τὴν Ἑλλάδα: ubi citatur Eustath. l. N. p. 951, 42=929, 41. ἐκκορεῖν Ἑλλάδα ἢ κωμωδία λέγει τὸ ἐκκενοῦν καὶ ἐκκαθαίρειν ὥσπερ καὶ ἐσαροῦτο κατὰ τὰς φιλοκαλουμένας οἰκίας.

13. B. 1. 2. καπιχωριοῖς. H. 1. 2. ΠΑΝΧΗΜΕΡΟΙ. Inde potest erui ΚΑΝ ΑΤΧΝΟΙ ΜΕΡΕΙ, lychnorum vice. Certe nequit intelligi ἐπιχωριοῖς οσμαιοῖς.

14. B. 1. 2. ΘΤΜΙΩCΙΝ ΕΙCΟΔΟΙC ΔΟΜΩΝ. H. 1. 2. ΘΤΜΑΙΕΙΝΑ. Inde eruas ΘΤΙΑ ΠΝΕΙ ΜΑΔ ΗΔΕ' ΑCΒΟΔΟC.

15. B. 1. 2. υπνου. H. 1. 2. υπνους. Neque ὕπνου—neque ὕπνους — ἐκλιπεῖν Græce dici potest. Latet, ni fallor, ἵχνος. Syntaxis est ἀμείψῃ ἵχνος, ἐκλιπῶν πύλας.

19. Antistrophica ante Hermannum detexit Elmsleius in Notis MSS. penes me.

23. B. 1. 2. δένδρεσι λεπταν. H. 1. 2. ΔΕΝΔΡΩΝΚΛΕΙΝΗΝ. Ibi latet δένδρω ἐλείνῃν.

25. B. 1. 2. ορθρευομενα γοοις. H. 1. 2. ΘΙΤΟΡΕΤΟΜΕΝΑΤΘΟΝ. Hic latet vox Ατθιν. Vid. mea ad Æsch. Suppl. 58.

26. B. 1. 2. πολυθρηνον. H. 1. 2. ΝΟΑΤΟΡΑΜΑ. Unde alii aliquid eruent.

27. B. 1. 2. συριγγας δ ουριβαται. H. 1. 2. ΕΤΡΙΠΘΕΛΟ-ECTIAN. Egrege Bekker. σύριγγας. At male ουριβαται: quod frustra Hermannus tuetur contra Porsonum ad Hec. 208. Olim conjeci ΟΙΟΒΟΤΑΙ, quod vix et ne vix quidem differt ab OECTIAN.

28. Olim volui ποιμένα δ' ἔπειται, et hodie volo.

29. ἔρχονται conjecit Elmsleius.

35. Conjecturam ἄκατοι, pro ακοντοι in B. 1. 2. H. 1. 2. sibi vindicat nescio quis Germanus teste Hasio apud *Gail. Philologue* IV. p. 107.

43. πρότονον conjecit Elmsleius ante Hermannum.

44. B. 1. 2. κοσμειν υμεναιω δε δεσποσυνων. H. 1. 2. ΚΟC-ΜΟΥΝ ΤΜΕΝ.ΙΙΩΝ ΔΕΔΕΧΗΟCΤΝΕΧΩ. Illud εχω pertinet ad v. 52.

45. εαγει in αγει post me correxit Hermannus.

47 et sqq. Ita lego, Εὐάμεροι προσιοῦσαι Μολπαὶ θράσος ἀπύουσ' Ἐπιχάρμα τ'· εἰ δὲ τύχα τι τέκοι, Βαρὺν βαρεῖ ἄν φόβον ἔπεμψε φάτις. Vox ultima latet in ΦΑΙC, quod H. 2. exhibet: cujus vice B. 1. 2. οικοις. At H. 1. ΦΑΟΙC. Merops, Deum sciscitatus de nuptiis futuris, responsum secundum videtur accepisse.

48. B. 1. 2. θρασος απυουσ'. H. 1. ΟΡΑC ΘΕΑΜΤC. H. 2. ΟΙΔΩCΑ. TC.

51 et sqq. Epodica ad legem Euripideam a me primo detectam sic constitui debent:

ὀρίζεται δ' εὖ τὸ φῶς γάμων τέλος
βολῆς τὸ λοιπὸν εὖ καὶ πέρα γ' ἔχοι
λίσσομένα προσέβ-
αν Ἱμῆναιον·
ἀεῖσαι φίλον
φίλων δεσποτᾶν
θεὸς ἔδωκε χρόνος ἔκρανε
λέχος· ἐμοῖσιν ἀρχέλαις, ἄγ',
ἴτω τελεία
γάμων αἰοιδά.

Inter hæc B. 1. 2. οριζεται δε το φαος γαμων τελος. H. 1. 2. ΟΡΙΖΕΙΑΡΧΕ ΤΟΦΑΟC ΓΑΜΩΝ ΙΟΔΩΝ. Μοx B. 1. 2. το δη ποτ ευχαις εγω. H. 1. 2. Το ΛΗΠΟΙΟ ΤΙΤΚΑΤΕΕΡΩ, literis IT minio inductis. Inde erui βολῆς τὸ λοιπὸν εὖ καὶ πέρα γ' ἔχοι quod postremum latet in ἔχω, quas literas exhibent H. 1. 2. in v. 44. voci δεσποσύνων subjectas. Construe τὸ λοιπὸν βολῆς ἔχοι τέλος εὖ καὶ πέρα γε. Per τὸ λοιπὸν βολῆς intellige *Vesperem*: quod tempus inter nuptialia fuit celebratum.

Formula ἔχει τέλος est proba. Cf. Prom. 13. necnon de locutione εὐ καὶ πέρα γε satis jam dixi ad Æsch. Eum. 213. et in Cl. Jl. No. XXVI. p. 372.

55. B. 1. 2. H. 1. 2. ελωκει, Dobræus ante Hermannum εδωκε.

58. B. 1. 2. προ δομων. H. 1. 2. πολωτω. Latet aliquid, fortasse προδ πυλῶν.

60. B. 1. 2. ^{δι}τριπλουν. H. 1. ^{δι}τριπλουν. H. 2. τυπιλουν. Ipse olim probavi διπλοῦν, quia rex et præco idem fuit. Unde hoc sciverim, quærit Hermannus. Respondeo, e verbis κηρύσσω βασιλῆιον—Fateor tamen hodie meum in ea re peccatum. Rectius τριπλοῦν tuetur Hermannus.

68. B. 1. 2. ω τε. H. 1. 2. ex emendatione ω ιτε.

70. B. 1. 2. H. 2. αυτωδαν. H. 1. αυιωδαν. Hermannus edidit αἰτῶ δ' αἶσαν, ita interpretatus, Indico reverentiam regis, precorque felicitatem. Atqui ὁσία non Græce dicitur reverentia, neque αἶσα felicitas. Longe præstat meum αὐτῶ δ' αὐδάν.

1. B. 1. 2. ερηνυαι. H. 1. ΘΕΡΗΙΟΝ. H. 2. ΘΕΗΙΟΝ.

2. B. 1. 2. εμφανη. H. 1. 2. εμφν.

3. B. 1. 2. δομους νεκυν. H. 1. ΔΟΜΟΤ. H. 2. ΑΘΜΕΗ. Ibi latere suspicor vocem ΑΘΑΙΟΝ. Scripsit fortasse Euripides οὐκ οἶσεν ἄθλιον νέκυν.

4. B. 1. 2. ΠΟCIC ΠΟCIC ΜΟΛΠΑΙCΙ ΟΝ ΓΑΜΗΛΙΟC. H. 1. 2. ΤΙΘΕΙC ΠΟCIC ΜΕΝΟΝ, ceteris omissis. Mox B. 1. 2. ΜΟΛΠΑΙC ΑΤΤΕΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΙC ΗΓΟΤΜΕΝΟC. H. 1. ΑΙΟΑΙΑΙΑΝ ΑΤΤΕΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΝ. H. 2. ΑΙΟΑΙΑΙΑΝΤΙCΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΝ. In utroque deest ἡγουμενος. Inde potest erui facillime

ΙΕΙC ΤΙC ΟΠΑ ΜΕΛΠΟΤCΑΝ ΕΝ ΓΑΜΗΛΙΟΙC

ΑΙΟΑΙΑΙΑ ΜΟΤCΑΝ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΕΤΜ ΑΓΕΙ ΝΟΜΟΙC,

i. e. ἰεῖς τις ὅπα μέλπουσαν Αἰολίδα μοῦσαν ἐν γαμηλίοις νόμοις ἄγει παρθένευμα. De formula ἰεῖς—ὅπκι cf. Hec. 338. φθογγὰς ἰεῖσα Trph. T. 294. ἰέναι μυκήματα Suppl. 281. ἡλεμον ἰεῖσαν. De phrasi ἐν γαμηλίοις—νόμοις cf. Tro. 352. μέλεσι γαμηλίοις.

De Musa Æolica, cf. dictum Lasi apud Athen. p. 624. F. ὕμνον ἀνάγων Αἰολίδα καὶ βαρύβρομον ἀρμονίαν. De παρθένευμα pro παρθένον, cf. Hipp. 11. πίτθεως παιδεύματα. De more virginem ducendi ad sponsi ædes trita sunt omnia. Hymenæo audito, Clymena pompam nuptialem appropinquare intelligit.

6. Ante Hermannum Dobræus οὐ θᾶσσον. Mox idem nuperrime conjecit οὐ σταλαγμόν. Hermannus ἀμολγον, quo, quicquid turbidum est, significari affirmat. Credat Judæus, non ego.

8. Ante Hermannum Dobræus ἐπείγεται, εἶα, ἑμῶδες, adjunctus quodammodo conjectura me ἑμῶδες ἐγκρύψω.

9. B. 1. ἐνθ' ἐμῶ κει πο. B. 2. ἐνθ' ἐμῶ κείται ποσει: quo modo supplere voluerunt Dobræus et Elmsleius.

10. B. 1. σφρ... B. 2. σφραγιζομαι: uti ipse suppleveram ope Eurip. Iph. T. 1372. 12. B. 1. ορθῶς. B. 2. ορθος.

13. B. 1. 2. οστις τα σιγωντ'. H. 1. 2. ος μετα σπωντ'.

14. Hæc eloquitur non Chorus, qui jam e scena exierat, ut opinor, post v. 12. 'Επείγεται', εἶα, ἑμῶδες. verum coetus ille, cujus adventum Clymena jam prospexerat, nuptias celebraturus.

15. Omnes εἰδομεν. Ante Hermannum Dobræus ἀεῖδομεν.

16. "ἐρώτων ποτνίαν, quod non intellexit Burgesius, quid esset vel ex Homero Il. Φ. 470. didicisse debebat." Ita Hermannus; qui tamen locum ab eo citatum non satis ipse didicit. Ibi enim πότνια θηρῶν Ἀρτεμις ἀγροτέρη intellexit Hermannus ope Latinæ versionis *domina ferarum Diana agrestis*. Ipse vero, qui versiones Latinas soleo contemnere, ita intelligenda esse verba Homeri statuo, "Ἀρτεμις πότνια, ἀγροτέρη θηρῶν, Diana scilicet plerumque πότνια, fuit eo tempore pia: ira feris agrestior, ideoque μάλα νείκεσε—καὶ ὀνειδίον φάτο μῦθον. Metro tandem reperto hodie volo τὰν ἐρώτων ἐπαγωγὸν παρθένοις τὰν γαμοστολὸν Ἀφροδίταν.

18. B. 1. 2. νυμφιας.. H. 1. νυμφια. H. 2. ΝΥΜΦΙΑΣ ΦΑΘ. Inde eruit Hermann. νυμφεῖ ὀφέιλω. Atqui phrasis ista Græcis fuit inaudita.

20. B. 2. τω. B. 1. σω, si recte Bekkeri manum perspicio. Mox vice νεόσυγιστω olim volui hodieque volo νέων συγίω: cui metrum favet. Hermannus vult μονόσυγι σφ— At quomodo Amor dici possit μονόζυξ, ipse fortasse probe scit Hermannus. Id quidem Græci nesciunt.

21. Criminandi studio abreptus in me totus ruit Hermannus propter malam, uti inquit, interpretationem, quam gl. Hesychianæ promulgavi. Atqui nihil tale feci. Contuli quidem, nihil amplius, verba Poetæ incerti apud Hesych. in Πῶλος cum dicto Eubuli apud Athen. p. 568. E. Notulam meam Hermannus aut noluit aut non potuit intelligere.

Ibid. B. 1. 2. κρυπτεῖς. H. 1. 2. ΔΑΤΩΝ. Latet ibi vel ΔΑΔΩΝ vel ΚΑΛΑΔΩΝ. Nuncupatur Ἐρως κληδούχος θαλάμων

in Hipp. 541. et δαδούχος θεός in Aristænet. II. 5. Exstat tamen δαύεις in Sapph. Fragm. apud Etymol. V. ipsa: unde, servato δαυων, alii melius aliquid eruere poterunt.

23. B. 1. 2. α τον μεγα. H. 1. 2. διονυσω. Latet hic aliquid, sagacioribus commendandum.

25. Ex αστερωτοισι δομοισι olim erui αστερ' ως τοισι δομοισι. Locis a me jam citatis adde Aristoph. Av. 1709. Πρόσέρχεται γὰρ οἷος οὔτε παμφαῆς Ἀστὴρ ἰδεῖν ἔλαμψε χρυσαυγῇ οὐμῳ πεσονοῦ Ἀλιαν. V. H. xiii. l. de Atalanta ὥσπερ ἀστὴρ διάττουσα ἐξέλαμψεν, et Hom. Il. X. 26. de Ἀχιλλεῖ παμφαίνονθ' ὥτ' ἀστέρ': unde intelligās et corrigas Etymol. p. 710, 30. ὁ δὲ Ἀντίμαχος Σειρίνα τὸν Δία ἔφη διὰ τὸ ἄστρον legendo "Σειρῇν ἄτ' ἐν εἰδει" ἔφη διὰ τὸ ἄστρον, collato Eustath. ad Od. M. p. 1720, 54=471, 26. Σειρήνες, τὰ ἄστρα.

26. B. 1. αρχαιον. B. 2. αρχεον. Mox B. 1. Αφροδιταν. B. 2. Η. 1. 2. Αφροδιτα.

27. Malim ὦ μακάρων βασιλείως μείζαν ὄλβος.

31. B. 1. 2. υμνησεται. H. 1. 2. υμνησων. MS. ipse, ni fallor, exhibet ὑμῶν ἄσεται. De verbo ἄσεται alibi depravato vid. Porson. ad Med. 44.

32. B. 1. 2. δομους αγων κορας. H. 1. ΘΟΜΟΑΙΩΝΑΙΩΙΑΝ. H. 2. ΟΟΜΟΔΤΩΝΑΙΩΙΑΤ. Inde erui potest ΟΧΛΩΝ ΑΓΩΝ ΑΙΩΙΑΙΜΟΝ. Lege igitur καί τις vice καί τάσδ.

37. Meum ποιέσθαι tacite edidit Hermannus.

42. D. ΠΡΟΣΕΛΘΙΝ ΤΕΜΕΝΟC ΕC ΕΤΩΝΤΜΟΤ. B. 1. 2. Η. 1. 2. ΕΞ ΕΜΩΝ ΔΟΜΩΝ.

43. D. ΕΚ ΝΟΜΩΝ. B. 1. 2. H. 1. 2. ΕΚ ΔΟΜΩΝ.

44. D. ΕΤ ΑΡΛΤCΜΕΤΑ. H. 1. ΙΗΡΑΤCΜΕΝΑ. H. 2. ΙΗΡΑΤCΜCΠΑ. B. 1. 2. CΕΜΝΑ ΘΗΡΑΤCΜΙΤΑ. Meum θησαυρίσματα hic et paulo ante ἔστρεψ' Hermannus comprobatur.

45. B. 1. 2. ΔΙΑΡΜΩΝ ΕΞΑΜΕΙΒΕΤΑΙ ΠΤΑΗC. H. 1. 2. ΔΙΑΡΕΙΩΝ ΕΤΑΜΕΤΡΕΙC. D. ΔΙ ΑΡΙΘΜΩΝ. Hinc eruo facillime δι' ἀριθμῶν ἤξε' μὴ τρέσης τι τλάς. Ubi verba μὴ τρέσης τι τλάς sunt Meropis servum deponere metum jubentis. Quod ad τι τλάς cf. Phoen. 1740. δεινὰ τλάς ἐγώ. Τί τλάς; Certe hic πύλης est vox nihili.

46. B. 1. 2. ΚΑΤΑΙΝΟΤ ΜΕΛΑΙΝΑΝΩC ΕΝΔΟΘΕΝ ΣΤΕΓΗC. H. 1. vice ΝΩC exhibet ΗΩC. H. 2. ΗΕΙC. D. ΜΕΛΑΙΝΑΙC. Inde eruo ΚΑΤ ΙΠΝΟΝ ΜΕΛΑΙΝΑ ΔΙΓΝΤC: ubi redde κατ' ἵπνον more fornicis. Mox Meropi tribue ἐνδοθεν στέγης; Πῶς; dein Servo, θεῖς πρόσωπον vice προς θεῖς. Hic λιγνύς debetur Hermanno, cui suum καπνοῦ præripuit Elmsleius.

48. B. 1. 2. Δ' ΟΙΚΟΝ. D. ΛΟΙΜΟΤ. Mox B. 1. 2. ενκαπνου. H. 1. 2. ΕΝΑΩΝΑΙΘΙΠΟΤ. Unde sagaciter Hermannus eruit ἐνδὸν αἰθάλου.

49. B. 1. 2. εσιθ'. H. 1. 2. D. εσθ.

50. H. 1. 2. D. ΕΠΕΙCΦΕΡΕΙC. B. 1. 2. ΕΠΕΙCΦΡΕΙC: quod νε:bum nihili frustra tueri conatus est Hermannus.

51. B. 1. 2. ΗΔΙCΤΟΙCΙΝ — ΓΑΜΟΙC. H. 1. 2. ΠΑΙCΙ-

OICIN — ΤΑΦΙ. Inde eruas ΑΠΑΙCΙΟΙCIN — ΤΑΦΟΙC. Vocem ἀπαισιώτερον Æsopicæ Fab. xxii. apud Rochefort in Notice des Manuscrits T. ii. p. 723. restituit Schæfer et Boissonad. ad Marin, p. 141.

52. B. 1. 2. Η. 1. θυμάτων. H. 2. θυμάτων.

55. B. 1. 2. επιστάται. D. επιστυλμάτων. H. 1. 2. ΕΠΙCΤΑΙ ΛΑΜΑΙ.

56. B. 1. 2. εχει. D. εχεις. 58. B. 1. 2. ληρβεντα. D. λαφουν. 59. B. 1. 2. Δημητρος. D. δημητηρ.

60. B. 1. 2. ΕΙΗΤΕΤΜΕΝΕΙC ΔΟΜΟΙC ΕΜΟΙC. H. 1. 2. ΕΙΠΡΕΠ ΕΤΜΕΡΕΙC ΚΟΜΟΙC ΕΜΟΙC. D. ΕΙΗΡΕΜΘΤΜΕΝΕΙC ΝΟΜ. Inde erui debet ΗΤΕ ΠΡΕΤΜΕΝΕΙC ΚΟCΜΟΙC ΝΕΩ. propitii estis ornatui ædium.

62. In scenam regreditur Chorus.

63. B. 1. 2. ΤΙΝΑΘΕΡ ΗΓΑC ΤΠΟΚΤΘΟC. D. ΤΙΝΑΘΕΡ ΗΤΑCΤΝΟΚΕΤΘΛ. H. 1. ΤΙΝΑΘΟΡ. H. 2. ΤΙΝΑCCP.

65. D. ΩΜΟΙ ΜΟΙ ΚΑΚΑΕΤΦΑΜΗCΕΙC. B. 1. 2. ιω μοι μοι καταφανησεται. Lege omnino — κακα φανησεται.

69. B. 1. 2. πυριβολοι πλαγαι λεχεα θ' Αλιου. H. 1. ΠΤΡΙΒΟΛΟΙΠΛΑΓΑΙΛΕΧΕΑΙΑΛΙΟΥ. H. 2. ΠΤΡΙΒΟΛΟΤΠΑΛΑΜΝΑΙΟΥΤΕΧΕΑΙΑΛΙΟΥ. D. ΠΤΡΙΡΟΝ ΘΕΠΑΛΤΑΙΛΕΧΕΑΙΑΛΙΕΤ.

73. B. 1. 2. ΓΟΝΤΤΑΙCΦΑΓΑC. D. ΓΟΝΤ ΤΑΙCΦΑΓΑΙC. Sensus postulat πατρός, ἴθι, πρόσπεσε γόνυ· λίσσου φυγάς σφαγὰς ἀρκέσαι σᾶς δειρᾶς. Ora exilium depellere posse cadenti a certivce.

74. B. 1. 2. CAC ΔΕΙΡΑC. H. 1. CACΔΕΙΡΑC. D. ΕΛΕΑΙΡΑΙ. H. 2. CΟΛΕΘΡΑC.

76. B. 2. ηκουσ' ^ταπαρχης. B. 1. ηκουσατ αρχης. D. ηκουσ απαρχας.

Hac occasione illos moneo, quos Hermannus aliqua parte decipere potuit, me Bekkeri apographum penes Dobræum summa fide exhibuisse; nisi in fragmenti prioris V. 30. ubi Bekker. scripsit συνζυγίαι, ipse edidi συζυγίαι

50.	ελωκει }	ελωκε
-----	----------	-------

obelo, transfixo,
in posterioris vero

V. 3.	ubi Bekker.	εις	ipse edidi	ες
9.		ξειστοισι		ξειστοισι
18.		νυμφιας . . (sic)		νυμφιας
36.		σωφρων		συμφρων
51.		ηδιστοισιν		ηδιστοισι
57.		ειμι		ειμ'

In locis reliquis, ubi me vel negligentia vel male fidei Hermannus accusat, is plane falsus est.

NOTICE OF

*DECIMI J. JUVENALIS et A. PERSII
FLACCI SATIRÆ; EX EDD. RUPERTI ET
KÆNIG, EXPURGATÆ. Accedunt, in gratiam Ju-
ventutis, Notæ quædam Anglice scriptæ. Londini.
In Ædib. Valpian. duod. 5s. 6d.*

ALTHOUGH this Edition is expressly intended for schools, and eminently calculated to instruct the young student, by explaining the difficulties of the author in a set of clear and judicious notes, yet the maturer scholar will find in it much critical matter worthy of his attention. The editor thus modestly introduces his labors :

“In this little edition of two Roman satirists, whose works are in modern times usually united in the press, the text of Ruperti in his last edition has been followed in the one, and that of Kœnig in the other; suppressing carefully in each, such passages as, on account of their indelicacy, are unfit for the eye of youth.

“Public opinion seems to have declared in favor of the utility of appending to editions of the classics used for the purpose of conveying the earliest instruction, a body of notes in the vernacular tongue, in preference to Latin. The latter are reluctantly consulted, and in some instances may be found to need explanation as much as the text. In preparing the notes to the present edition, the same method has been pursued as in a preceding edition of Virgil, which has been received by the public with unexpected favor. The principal commentators on each author have been carefully consulted and compared, and the result briefly stated, without entering into thorny disputes, or venturing, in cases of difficulty, on conjectural emendations of the text.”

We shall give a few specimens of the Notes, from the first Satire.

81. *Ex quo*; tempore, understood. From the time of Deucalion's flood, all the business of men shall afford me subjects. 82. *sortes*: oracular responses. 86. *discursus*: busy endeavours:—conatus, labores, atq; opes aut dignitates adipiscendas. *Factiologi*. 88. *Major—sinus*: allusive either to spreading open the lap to receive more money, or to expanding all sails to the wind. 89. *Hos animos*? with the ellipse of *magis vexavit*; or some other words of similar import, as Britannicus thinks. When was gambling so boldly practised? The ellipse of a verb is frequent; but that of *magis*, also, Heinecke thinks improbable, and would change *Hos*, into *Ille*; with the ellipse of *capit*. 90. *posita—arca*: the

whole chest, the player's entire fortune, staked. 91. *Prælia quantæ!*—how large the stakes!—*dispensatore—Armigera!* the servant bringing the money: some think, the caster, or the person furnishing dice, boxes, or other instruments of play.—*Sumptæ furore?* Can this be termed extraordinary madness?

155. *Pone—in illa:* make Tigellinus your butt, and you will be burnt alive, enveloped in the toga molesta, a cloth smeared with pitch and other inflammable substances. On a false accusation of the Christians as incendiaries, it appears by Tacitus Annal. xv. 40. that, among other dreadful punishments, this was inflicted. 156. *fixo gutture:* the throat kept erect by being pierced with an iron hook. 157. *Et latum—deducis arena.* In different Mss. the reading varies; particularly, in the penultimate word. Besides *deducis*, as in the text, appear *deducit*, *deducat*, and *producit*. The meaning also is more in dispute than perhaps that of any other line occurring in any classic author. Some explain *sulcum*, to mean the trace made in the sand by the body of the miserable victim, dragged to execution. Of this opinion is Heinecke. Ruperti and others apply it to the cavity in which fuel was piled about the sufferer. Others, more improbably, to the track made by his feet, in the vain attempt to escape the fire; and others, most improbably of all, to a stream of melted fat exuding and pouring down from the consuming body, marking its course in the sand. In two communications to the Class. Journ. v. 415. and vi. 125. a new explanation is proposed of this difficult line. By the first critic two alterations are introduced into the text, not appearing warranted by any Ms. *Et latus in media sulcum deducit arena:* explaining *sulcum*, to mean the stream of light emitted by the burning side of the victim, and referring to An. ii. 697. for the use of *sulcus*, in an analogous sense. The second communication adopts and approves this explication, but prefers *deducis*, on the authority of Hor. A. P. 129. where it is employed in a future sense. Those who may consider this as the poet's meaning, need not commit violence on the text, or interpret *latus* as a substantive. The only difficulty would be the quantity of the final syllable of *media*. To scan this as an anapaest, the first writer is pleased to consider as "trash;" "not worth repeating," carrying its own refutation; he himself, apparently, being unaware of the effect of the cesura. On occasions of difficulty, every writer is his own best interpreter, where resort can be had to his own authority. Juvenal says, vii. 48, 49.

—hæc agimus, tenuique in pulvere sulcos

Ducimus, et litus sterili versamus aratro.

The same metaphor, possibly, is here intended. The poet may mean that he who attacks Tigellinus will end his days in torment: and besides, what can he expect to effect? He will but lose his labor. The object of the satirist is reformation of manners: to state the probable failure in that object, as well as the loss of the satirist's life, does not seem so violent an anticlimax. This may not be the true explanation: the text may be corrupt, or the sense not yet elucidated. But in this explanation there is certainly nothing absurd, as is broadly asserted; nor does it call for any conjectural emendations on the text, which on very rare occasions indeed can be justified. With this interpretation, *deducis* must be adopted. It is true, *latum*, and *media*, become not very significant epithets; but such also is *tenui*, in the parallel passage. The late Professor Porson for *deducit*, proposed to read, *quæ ducit*, referring *quæ* to *tædæ*, and supposing the error to arise from careless transcription. Class. Journ. viii. 178.

We rejoice in every opportunity of showing our respect for the opinion of POKSON, and we scruple not to adopt his reading of this very difficult passage.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM;

Or, 1 COR. xi, 10. explained.

I SEND one other explanation of this passage in addition to those, which I have already furnished; and I leave the explanation to the judgment of the Biblical reader, without meaning to vouch for or to protest against its propriety, but with the remark that explanation is both safer and better than emendation, in discussing the sacred volume.

Thetford, Sept. 1822.

E. H. BARKER.

“DIONYS.’ Sub initium Xtianæ religionis non viros tantum, sed et feminas prophetasse, divini scriptores nos docent. Divus Paulus 1 ad Cor. xi, (10.) eas precantes et prophetantes jubet esse operto capite, secus quam viri debent. Erat hoc in mulieribus subjectionis quoddam signum et modestiæ. Quare autem feminas viris subjectas esse oporteat, ignorare non possumus, cum constet, ut Apostolus scribit, non virum propter mulierem, sed mulierem propter virum esse creatam. Tum additur: *Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνή ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, i. e., ut vulgo vertitur, *Ideo debet mulier potestatem habere supra caput, propter Angelos*. Hæc Apostoli verba et mihi, et multis aliis videntur esse satis obscura. Velim, Antoni, ut de tuo lumine mihi lumen accendas; nam nihilominus tibi lucebit, cum mihi accenderis. ANT. A quovis potius, quam a me tibi lutuen expectes; ipse enim in tenebris versor; vel saltem non satis video. Tale mihi lumen est,

Qualia sublucent fugiente crepuscula Phæbo;

Aut ubi ~~non~~ abiit, nec tamen orta dies.

DIONYS. Dic tamen, quidquid sit, quod vides. ANT. Erat olim, cum mihi valde placeret Nortoni Knatchbulli, cujus jam antea memini, conjectura. Is putat Apostolum velle dicere, quod mulier debeat in capite suo, h. e. viro, qui mulieris caput est, potestatem agnoscere, idque præter legem ab Angelis Dei nomine latam:—‘Potestatem,’ inquit, ‘debet agnoscere in viro per vel propter Angelos, i. e. per vel propter ipsum Deum, per

vel propter legem creationis vel ordinationem Dei, qui in prima creatione per ministerium Angelorum in hoc ordine creavit illos, atque eo ipso tempore imposuit etiam per ministerium Angelorum mulieri hanc legem subjectionis, cujus meminit 1. ad Cor. xiv, 34.' Sed, præterquam quod verbum ἔχειν non ita sæpe pro agnoscere sumitur, nimis longe petitiū videtur per Angelos intelligere legem Angelorum ministerio latam. Verum quidem est legem alibi datam dici per Angelos; sed cedo locum, quicumque potes, quo per Angelos lex intelligitur Angelorum ministerio data. DIONYS. Non possum. PAUL. Neque ego. ANT. Neque alius, opinor, quisquam. Mihi videtur nobilissimi loci hic esse sensus:—Non oportere, ut mulier in semet ipsa ullam potestatem habeat possideatve; sed omnem potestatem habeat in viro, qui ipsius caput est. Sicut caput, quod mentis animique esse sedes putatur, potestatem habet in reliqua membra; ita quoque vir in mulierem: maxime autem maritus in uxorem, de quibus Paulus potissimum loquitur. Quidquid corporis membra possunt ac valent, istud omne habent a capite. Ita mulier omnem legitime agendi potestatem sitam habet in viro, qui eam regit. PAUL. Verum est illud Poëtæ cujusdam Gr.

Γυναικὶ δ' ἄρχειν οὐ δέδωκεν ἡ φύσις,
Mulieri natura non dedit, ut imperet.

ANT. Hoc est, quod Paulus dicit 1. ad Tim. ii, 12. Γυναικὶ δὲ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, Mulieri non permitto docere, neque dominari in virum, sed esse in silentio. Videatur Gen. iii, 16. DIONYS. Hactenus non male. Sed quid istud est propter Angelos. ANT. Audies. Mea sententia propter Angelos idem est, quod propter exemplum Angelorum. Intelligit autem D. Scriptor bonos Angelos, qui nullam sibi potestatem arrogant, sed eam omnem sitam habent in ipso Deo, illorum nostrique omnium creatore. Quidquid agunt, agunt Dei nomine et jussu: sunt enim πνεύματα λειτουργικά, Spiritus ministratorii, semper sua statione contenti. Potuisset Apostolus multas alias rationes addere, propter quas feminæ non debeant sibi propriam potestatem vindicare; sed putavit satius esse, si egregium bonorum Angelorum exemplum proponeret. Certe mulieres, quæ sua sorte et statione non contentæ vivunt, seque contra viros efferunt, similes sunt malis Angelis, οὗς, ut D. Judas v. 6. scribit, μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὁ Κύριος τετήρηκεν, Quos non servantes originem suam, sed derelinquentes proprium domicilium suum Dominus vinculis æternis sub culigine reservavit ad judicium

magni diēi. Vides, Dionysi, quod mihi de Pauli loco videtur. Per me licet, ut alii eum aliter ac melius explicant.”

Antonii Borremansii *Dialogus Literarius*

de Poëtis et Prophetis, Amstelædani, 1678. 12mo. p. 125

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

IN Blomfield's Glossary on Æsch. Pers. 1057.

Καὶ μοι γενεῖαν πέρθε λευκὴν τριχά, . . .
occurs the following note: “*Λευκήρης. *Albus*. Hæc vox contra analogiam peccat; nullum aliud adjectivum in ηρης cum adjectivo componitur; vid. supra ad v. 414. Melius esset λευκανθῆ. Soph. Œd. T. 742. χνοάζαν ἄρτι λευκανθῆς κάρα.” The inaccuracy of this criticism may be demonstrated by the following examples of adjectives perfectly analogous to λευκήρης: Δολιχόρης, Oppian. Cyneg. 1, 407. Hal. 2, 497. Nicander Ther. 183. Ολογόρης, ibid. 284. Μονήρης, Athen. 7. p. 301. 321. Lucian. Tim. 42. Amor. 27. Ομήρης, Nicander Alex. 70. 261. Ενομήρης, 238. 620. Συνομήρης, 449. In Stephens' Thesaurus, Μεγήρης and Πανήρης are adduced from Hesychius. Ίσήρης, Eurip. Iph. T. 1472. Μεσσήρης, Iph. A. 8. Ion. 910. and even in Æschylus, Suppl. 33. is found Ταχυήρης.

The note in the Glossary on v. 414. referred to above, likewise demands a few observations: “Χαλκήρης. *Fire instructus*: Hesych. Χαλκήρεας, χαλκῶ ἡρμοσμένους. Apud Polluc. 1. 83, ubi navis partes recensentur, pro χαλκῆνης, voce ignobili, reponendum puto χαλκήρης.” [Similarly in v. 1057. for λευκήρη the edition of Robertellus exhibits λευκήνη.] “Infra 422. κωπήρης est remis instructus. In Eurip. Cycl. 15. ἀμφῆρες δόρυ est navis utrinque instructus, sc. remis. κωπήρες σκάφος Hel. 1397. Composita sunt ab ἄρω. Infra 1057. λευκήρης.” This note must imply that all adjectives terminating in ηρης are compounds of ἄρω. But in that case, what becomes of the obvious words διήρης, τριήρης, ἐπτήρης, πεντήρης, and innumerable others of the same family, which are universally derived from ἐρέσσω? Even Hesychius, to whose authority an appeal is made for the derivation of χαλκήρης, thus derives ἀμφήρης: ἀμφήρεις νῆες ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὀρμώμεναι, ἢ ἐρεσσόμεναι. Neither ought the two following passages from Euripides, in which the derivation from ἄρω is not quite so convenient, to have been overlooked: Ion. 1147. ἀμφήρεις σκηναί, which Musgrave renders *ab omni parte exstructa tabernacula*: Heath *spatium undique includentia*; Merc. F. 243. ἀμφήρη ξύλα, rendered by Musgrave,

undecimque aram cingentia. , Brûnck's note on Soph. El. 89., in which words ending in *ης* are considered merely as adjectives of a peculiar termination and not compounds, would have been worthy of Blomfield's attention : " *Ἀντήρεις πλαγὰς στέριων, percussiones oppositis pectoris, seu oppositi pectoris planctus.* Quippe ut ictus cadatur pectus, oppositum illi esse debet, quod ictus infligitur. Bene monet Heathius *Ἀντήρης* non derivari ab *ἐρέσσω*, sed unice ab *ἀντί*. Terminatio illa *ης* permultorum vocabulorum nihil aliud est quam *paragoge*. At plerumque omnia grammatici composita esse somniant a substantivo et verbo, seu *ἐρέσσω*, seu *ἄρω*. Recti devius ad hunc locum Scholiastes, doctius ad Antig. 1136. *κισσῆρεις* interpretatur *κισσοφόρον*. Adjectivum est a *κισσός* deductum, non compositum a *κισσός* et *ἄρω*. Idem statuendum de *πιτρήρης*, *τυμβήρης*," [*χαλκήρης*, *καπήρης*, with *λογχήρης*, *ξιφήρης*, in Scapula's Lexicon absurdly placed under *ἄρω*,] "et alius hujus formæ, quorum plura recenset Valck. ad Phœn. 90. Ad sensum bene *Ἀντήρεις* exponitur in glossa *ἀντιτύπους*." The words of the Scholiast are these : *Πληγὰς ἀντήρεις. μετῆκται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρεσσόντων. οἷον πληγὰς κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν στέγων ἐλαυνομένης. ἢ ἀντήρεις, ἀντιθέτους, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἴσας τοῖς θρήνοις. μετῆκται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρεσσόντων, ὅταν κατ' ἴσον ἐρέσσωσι, καὶ μὴ εἰς θάλαρον περιωδῆται ἡ ναῦς. ἀντήρεις οὖν, ἀντικτύπουσας τοῖς θρήνοις.* This derivation from *ἐρέσσω*, to which Schneider assents, may seem to be in some measure confirmed by a similar use of this verb in Æsch. S. c. Th. 853. *Ἄλλα γῶν, ὦ φίλοι, κατ' οὖρον Ἐρέσσει ἀμφὶ κρατὶ πόμπιμον χειρὶν Πύτυλον :* Pers. 1047. *"Ερεσο", ἐρεσσε, καὶ στέναζ' ἐμὴν χάριν.* Hence Burges in Eur. Tro. 1237. reads *"Ερεσσε χειρὶ κρατ', ἐρεσσε κρατὰ πτύλους διδοῦσα χειρὸς, εὐτ' ἄρασσε, &c.*; but in v. 287. he has left *ἄρασσε κρατὰ κόρυμβον*, where the same emendation would have been equally applicable. In most instances, however, *Ἀντήρης* appears to be merely a derivative of *ἀντί*: Eur. Phœn. 765. *Καί μοι γένοιτ' ἀδελφὸν ἀντήρη λαβεῖν :* 1386. *ἀντήρη δ' ἐμὴν Καθαίματῶσαι δεξιᾶν νικηφόρον :* Iph. A. 224. *πῶλους—ἀντήρεις καμπαῖσι δρόρων*, on which passage the following note occurs in Beck's edition : "*Ἀντήρεις.* Alibi ap. Eurip. significat res, quarum frontes oppositæ sunt : v. Phœn. 782. Troad. 223. Hic interpreter : *qui in contrarias partes nituntur.* Heath. cum Brod. reddit : *sibi mutuo in flectendis metis respondentes :*" Troad. 223. *Φοινίκας ἀντήρη χάραν, situ oppositam*, Burges. The word *ταχυήρης* in Æsch. Suppl. 33. *ἔν ὄχῳ ταχυήρει Πέμφατι πόντονδ'*, is derived from *ἐρέσσω* by Schneider; and this the metaphor may possibly require. "Eadem licentia navis *ὄχος* ἀλὸς Oppiano dicitur, Theodoretὸ *ὄχημα θαλάττιον*, Noster *ναῦτιλον ὄχημα*, Prom. 467." Stanley, who however translates it simply *vehiculo celeri*.

With respect to the meaning of ἀμφῆρες δόρυ Heath has the following note: "Per ἀμφῆρες δόρυ non ipsam navem, sed gubernaculi clavum, indicari puto, qui ideo ἀμφῆρες dicitur, quod in utramque partem flecti et dirigi potest. Alias nihil est, quod a participio λαβῶν commodè regatur." Blomfield in the Glossary on Pers. 417. quotes the passage thus: ἐν πρύμνῃ δ' ἄκρα Αὐτὸς λαβῶν ἴθυνον ἀμφῆρες δόρυ, which appears to be a typographical error, not an emendation, for the common reading ἐν πρύμνῃ δ' ἄκρα. Whether Heath is correct in the meaning attached to δόρυ may admit of a doubt. There does not appear any great difficulty in understanding οἶακα after λαβῶν, to which ellipse the English vulgarism *take and steer* is analogous. Considering ἀμφήρης, in conformity with Brunck's opinion, merely as a derivative of ἀμφί, the words ἴθυνον ἀμφῆρες δόρυ may be rendered, *steer the vessel in either direction as may be required*.

Æsch. Prom. 768. " * Ἀναμυχθίζομαι. *Ingemisco*. Ἀμυχθίζω, quod verbum non memini, nisi in Anthol. 7. p. 612. καὶ σιμὰ σεσηρῶς Μυχθίζεις, *per nares sufflas*: hoc vero a μύζω, quod a sono μῦ formatum est: de quo plura ad Eumenidas." Blomf. Gloss. In Hemsterhusius' note on Lucian. T. 1. p. 353. the meaning of the compound ἀναμυχθίζω is more clearly defined, and additional instances are given of the simple verb μυχθίζω: "Apud Æschylum utique Pr. V. 742. Σὺ δ' αὖ κέκραγας κἀναμυχθίζῃ, *quin sit, ducto per nares spiritu ingemiscere, atque indignationem testari*, vix in dubium voces: eo spectat Hesychii Μυχθισμός, στεναγμός: nec alio fonte manantia μυττάζειν et μυττηκάζειν. Idem tamen irridere, et adunco naso subsannare designat: Hesych. Μυχθίζουσι, μυκτηρίζουσι, χλευάζουσι: neque aliter Suidas explicuit Meleagrum Anth. 7. Ep. 107. Φλέξω ναί τί μάταια γελάς, καὶ σιμὰ σεσηρῶς Μυχθίζεις; τάχα που σαυρόνιον γελάσεις. In Theocr. Id. 20. pro μυθίζοισα utrum v. 11. an 13. supponi debeat μυχθίζοισα, parumper hæsito: quamvis animum inclinent ad posteriorem locum producta Meleagri verba. Clare Origenes in Cels. 4. p. 187. Ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐγνωμον, ἐκεῖνα μὲν μὴ γελαῖν ὡς μῦθον, ἀλλὰ θαυμάζειν ὡς ἐν μύθῳ φιλοσοφούμενα ταῦτα δὲ μόνῃ τῇ λέξει τὴν διάνοιαν ἐναπερείσαντα μυχθίζειν: ubi sententiæ nexus qualem vim postulet, haudquaquam obscurum est." Stanley on Æsch. Eum. 117. quotes from Eustathius in Il. Δ. 20. Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μύζειν, καὶ ὁ μυκτηρ λέγεται, καὶ ὁ μυγμός, καὶ τὸ μυχθίζειν, παρὰ τε Αἰσχύλῳ καὶ ἄλλοις: and in the Fragments p. 49. Ed. Butler., μυχθίζειν is cited from Eust. ad Od. Ω. 415. To these instances may be added from Polyb. 15, 26, 8. Πρὸς εὐδὲν προσεῖχον τῶν λεγομένων, μυχθίζοντες δὲ καὶ διαψιθυρίζοντες ἐξελήρησαν.

PHŒNICIAN ANTIQUITIES AND ORIENTAL GEOGRAPHY.

WE received from Leyden, some days ago, three very interesting works, published in that city at different periods of the present year, 1822. For one we are indebted to the learned Professor Hamaker, whose excellent "*Specimen Catalogi Codicum Orientalium Bibliothecæ Academiæ Lugduno-Batavæ*," was briefly noticed in this Journal (No. XLVIII. Dec. 1821, p. 392.) The work which we at present announce is entitled "*Diatribæ Philologico-Critica Monumentorum aliquot Punicorum, nuper in Africa repertorum, interpretationem exhibens. Accedunt novæ in nummos aliquot Phœnicos Lapidemque Carpenteracensem conjecturæ, necnon tabulæ, inscriptiones et Alphabetâ Punica continentes*" (4to. 78 pages, 3 plates). It is divided into three chapters: the first of which explains the Phœnician inscriptions on some stone *cippi*, found on the site of ancient Carthage by Mr. Humbert, and now deposited in the Museum of the University of Leyden.—The first plate annexed to this Essay contains a representation of those cippi and of two fragments, found also by Mr. Humbert, the inscriptions appearing in the original character: these, however, are reduced by Professor Hamaker into Hebrew letters of equivalent powers; and as a specimen we shall copy one, (which is marked No. III.) with the Latin translation.

לרבתן תלת ול

בעלן לאדנן ב

על חסלא תלד

דגדצת תרת

הסבר בן עבעם נדר

"*Dominæ nostræ Tholath, et domino nostro, hero nostro, domino clementiæ Tholad, propter sectionem uvarum (vel 'misionem musti')* Hassobed, filius Abiam votum (vel 'ex voto')."

Another is thus rendered—"Dominæ nostræ Tholath. . . . et hero nostro, domino 'Thammouz Tholad, qui colitur hoc loco, propter sectionem uvarum (vel 'misionem musti') in agro qui hic (est)."
Another. . . . "et hero domino clementiæ Tholad, Ebed-Moneni filii Hamithal filii Ebed-

Baali"—and a fourth "Domino clementiæ Tholad.... domino Gabalæ." In justifying his explanation of these ancient legends, the Professor displays considerable ingenuity and erudition: more particularly respecting the name *Tholath* or *Tholad*, which, he undertakes to prove, expresses the twofold divinity—the lunar goddess, Venus, Astarte, Diana, &c., and the solar deity, Apollo, Baal, Osiris, Thammuz, Adonis, &c. The second chapter contains an account "vetusti lapidis, ab Illustrissimo Comite Camillo Borgia inter civitatis Tuggensis rudera inventi et delineati." This monument Prof. Hamaker regards as Sepulchral—the cippi above described having been, in his opinion, consecrated to the Gods. This Borgian inscription, (which Plate II. exhibits in the original Phœnician) is thus translated—" (Hoc est) monumentum Haäwæ filii Famcæ, coru (i. e. decoris) Siggæ, ministri Dei summi et collegii sacerdotum Tholathæ. Qui vero posuit (hunc cippum) Haäwæ filio Famcæ (secundum) desiderium ipsius (fuit) sacrificantium Doctor. Mco autem nomine ut sacrificium eucharisticum.... (mactate) et camelos feminas casque jugulate (hoc loco) epuli (funebri) caussa.... (mense) Nisane et Elule. Tum vos cantate hymnum illis qui (hic) strati sunt, et pernoctant, et plurimis annumerati sunt." To his elaborate explanation of this inscription, the Professor devotes nearly twenty-seven pages; through which, we regret, our limits will not allow us to attend him. His third chapter offers to the antiquarian philologer many interesting remarks and conjectures on the Phœnician language and the celebrated Carpentoractensian monument, the inscription on which Mr. H. thus interprets—"Benedicta (sis) Theba filia Thakui! Hoc donarium est Dei Osiridis. Iate nihil egisti contra maritum neque, sicubi placebat marito, unquam locuta es. (Ergo) intaminata sis coram Osiride, benedicta; coram Osiride honorata sis et florens; idque nunc et in posterum, et inter...." a translation, differing in some respects from that given by Kopp, in his "*Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit*," (T. II. p. 234). The third plate, with which Mr. Hamaker has illustrated this curious work, contains two Phœnician alphabets, exhibiting the characters as they appear on the monuments brought to Europe by Humbert, and in the Borgian inscription.

We now proceed to notice a little Essay (of 26 pages 4to.) entitled—"Periculum Animadversionum Archæologicarum ad Cippos Punicos Humbertianos," in which that learned

antiquary, Professor Reuven, referring to the "Diatriba" above-mentioned, of his accomplished friend and colleague Mr. Hamaker, and to the "Notice sur quatre cippes sepulcraux et deux fragmens, découverts en 1817, sur le sol de l'ancienne Carthage; par J. E. Humbert; (à la Haye, 1821)" examines with a keen antiquarian eye the symbolical sculptures and ornaments on those Phœnician monuments, the place where they were found, and their condition when first brought to light; and, comparing the result of this examination with the inscriptions (which we have copied in the preceding article), he endeavours to illustrate the history of those interesting remains. It appears that at first their form had deceived him, and that, like Mr. Humbert, he had regarded them as sepulchral; but he adopts the sentiments of Professor Hamaker respecting two, at least, of the cippi, and thinks it probable that all were votive. His remarks on the symbolical devices which those stones exhibit, are extremely ingenious, and display a considerable fund of archæological knowledge, particularly where he discusses the subject of that "manus cum brachio quæ spectatoris quasi oculis opponitur." (p. 5.) He then states his reasons for dissenting from the opinion of Mr. Hamaker, whom the inscriptions induced to believe, first, that on the spot where those cippi were found (in a village or district now called *Malga*), had once stood an edifice consecrated equally to Tholad and Tholatha, (Baal and Astarte) as divinities worshipped in the same temple; 2dly, that the stones are monuments of Punic, not of Roman, Carthage; and 3dly, that the sacred structure is extremely ancient, and certainly occupied the site of the primæval temple; and that on this spot should be sought the oldest vestiges of Carthage. For the argument urged by Professor Reuven, against these three positions, we must refer our readers to the Essay itself, which is embellished with a plate.

The next work to be here noticed is a quarto volume, of above three hundred pages, entitled "Specimen Geographico-Historicum, exhibens Dissertationem de Ibn Haukalo Geographo, necnon Descriptionem Iracæ, Persicæ, &c.;" by P. J. Vylenbroek, another ingenious and accomplished member of the University of Leyden, who devotes above eighty pages to an inquiry respecting *Ibn Haukal* (or *Ebn*, as Greaves, D'Herbelot, and others express the word). Having examined the Arabic work, bearing unequivocally this author's name (a valuable Ms. preserved

in the Leyden library), M. Vylenbroek conceived some doubts that it was not the original of a composition, which many years ago Sir William Ouseley translated from a Persian Ms. and published as "*The Oriental Geography of Ebn Haukal, a traveller of the tenth century.*"—As the author's name did not appear in Sir William's own Ms., nor in a copy of the same Persian work preserved at Eton, he endeavoured to ascertain it from other sources, and was induced to pronounce it the Geography of Ebn Haukal, in consequence of the numerous passages perfectly agreeing with extracts from Ebn Haukal, quoted by Eastern geographers, more particularly by Abûlseda. So convincing, indeed, were the proofs of identity adduced by Sir W. Ouseley, in his preface, that one of the most able and judicious critics and learned Orientalists of the present day, Mons. de Sacy, not only admitted them, after a very close examination, but confirmed them by additional corresponding extracts—as appears on reference to the "*Magazin Encyclopédique*," Tom. VI. wherein the "*Notice de la Géographie Orientale d'Ebn Haukal*," constitutes an elaborate article of more than one hundred pages. Sir William, it appears, regarded his Ms. as a Persian translation of Ebn Haukal's Arabic work, with some slight variations from the original text. Such variations as occur in almost all versions from one Eastern language into another, and mistakes arising from the negligence of successive transcribers, "*et à l'extrême liberté que prennent ceux de l'Orient de retrancher ou d'ajouter, en transcrivant, ce que bon leur semble à l'ouvrage qu'ils copient.*"—M. de Sacy, however, thinks the Oriental Geography, as translated by Sir W. Ouseley, to be rather an abridgment than an exact translation of Ebn Haukal's work, and that possibly the Persian translator had sometimes corrected his text, either from other writers, or from his own personal observations; the points in which the Persian and English differ from the Arabic not affecting their original identity—"Mais ces différences sont trop peu considérables, pour faire méconnoître dans la *Géographie Orientale*, l'ouvrage d'Ebn Haukal, cité par Aboulseda."—Yet some of those discrepancies induced Mr. Vylenbroek to regard the Arabic volume (that Ms. of the Leyden library above-mentioned) as the "*verum et genuinum Ibn Haukali opus Geographicum*," and the Persian Ms. (Sir W. O.'s Orient. Geogr.) as a more ancient work, and therefore neither a version nor an epitome of Ebn Haukal's, but one of which

this writer made considerable use in the composition of his work: "Sed talem quem Ibn Haukalus in suo scripto componendo maxime secutus sit." (p. 9.) Hence we find that "nexum arctissimum inter Geographiam Orientalem et Ibn Haukalum," (p. 51.) and those "loca G. O. et Ibn Haukali iisdem pæne verbis concepta." (p. 73.) Mr. Vylenbroek supposes the Persian work (and Orient. Geogr.) to have been composed by *Ibn Khordadbeh*, who flourished in the same century with Ibn Haukal, but some years before him; a point which he thinks his arguments have rendered, if not certain, at least highly probable: "nostram thesin, qua Geogr. Orientalem esse ipsum opus Ibn Khordadbehi statuimus, nisi certam at valde tamen verisimilem faciunt." (p. 61.) But it is, possibly, he allows, the work of *Abou Ishall el Faresius*, who appears however to have been the same as *Ibn Khordadbeh*. (pp. 60, 62.) This Persian work Ibn Haukal, whilst travelling, carried with him, and consulted as his guide, as well in planning his journeys as in describing them: hence the conformity between the Arabic and Persian compositions; but, adds Mr. V., as *Ibn Haukal* travelled some time after *Ibn Khordadbeh*, (or *Abou Ishall*) he may have found many alterations: hence one traveller would necessarily differ from the other in some descriptions. — "Hoc (opus Persicum) Ibn Haukalus, dum ditionem Moslemiticam peragravit, secum tulit, quo tanquam duce uteretur, tam in itineribus suis instituendis quam iisdem enarrandis: hinc in utroque opere formæ similitudo et multarum narrationum convenientia facillime oriri potuerunt. At Ibn Haukalus, quippe qui aliquamdiu post editum opus Ibn Khordadbeh iter suum instituit, varia vidit mutata," &c. (p. 61.) Still Mr. Vylenbroek acknowledges that "universum amborum operum habitum et ordinem unum esse et per omnia sibi similem." (51.) However satisfactory it may be to know the exact name of an author in whose work we are interested, the general reader will, perhaps, think it a matter of no very great importance whether the "*Oriental Geography*" was composed by Ibn Haukal, or by Ibn Khordadbeh. Abou Ishall, the Arabic and Persian works exhibiting in general so strong a conformity, and in many places being evidently almost literal translations one from the other; and both composed in the same century, according to Mr. Vylenbroek's account of Ibn Khordadbeh. (p. 56.) Wherever the titles of eastern books, or the names and dates of their authors are concerned, we find, almost

invariably, considerable subject for doubt and perplexity; the Ms. copies of the same work frequently differing in the most material passages.—Embarrassed by such difficulties, our ingenious author exclaims, in his inquiry respecting the true name and age of Ibn Haukal, “mira in his omnibus confusio.” (p. 7.) Respecting the Oriental Geography, he thinks it probable that a Persian Ms. brought by Sir W. Ouseley from Persia, and quoted in that gentleman’s travels lately published, may be a perfect translation of Ibn Haukal’s work.—“Ouseleyus V. Illust. in tomo primo nuperrime editi operis inscripti, *Travels in various Countries of the East*, &c. passim memorat codicem Persicum quem *Sur al balden* vocat,” &c.—(p. 51.) “Si ex paucis exemplis de toto opere judicium ferre liceat, illud absolutam et perfectam Geographiæ Ibn Haukali versionem continere videatur.”—(p. 55.) Whether it be so or not we must leave Sir William or others to ascertain, and proceed to notice the second portion of Mr. Vylenbroek’s work, which comprises in 84 pages the Arabic texts of several geographical authors, who have described the province of *Irak Ajem*, in Persia, otherwise called *Jebal*, or the mountainous region, Parthia, &c. And in the third part, containing 103 pages, is given a Latin translation of those Arabic texts, which are extracted from Ibn Haukal, Yakouti, Zacavia Ibn Mohammed Kazwini, Abulfeda, a Ms. geographical lexicon; Ibn Ayas, and Mohammed Ibn Abou Thaleb.—From the very excellent specimen here offered we are induced to express our hopes that an Orientalist, so admirably qualified for the task, as Mr. Vylenbroek evinces himself to be, will not limit his useful and interesting researches within the narrow space of one province, but by a complete translation of Ibn Haukal’s work, or of some other geographical composition, increase our knowledge of the whole Persian empire, and of the neighbouring countries.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

ACTS xi. 26—*And it came to pass—that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.* This verse is connected with circumstances of a peculiar and important nature that ought to be developed. Did the disciples call themselves

Christians? or did their enemies give them the name in order to stigmatise them as the followers of a crucified malefactor? The original is free from this ambiguity. *Ἐγένετο—χρηματίσαι πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς.*

The exact sense of this passage depends on the difference of meaning between *χρηματίζω* the active voice, and *χρηματίζομαι*, the middle or passive, as the former signifies 'to engage in business, to negotiate, in behalf of others,' see Thucyd. v. 5. Polyb. iv. 27, the latter 'to engage in business, on my own account, collect wealth for myself;' thus *πεχρηματισμένος* means '*enriched*,' Cyropæd. iii. 3. 4. Now as the persons most engaged in the business of others were ministers of religion, or magistrates and officers in the state, *χρηματίζω* in the active voice is peculiarly applicable to them, and hence signifies 'to give an answer,' as an oracle when consulted, or to pass a decree as the senate and people when a motion was made. This sense it bears in Xenophon's account of the Athenian Polity, iii. 1. and Demosth. p. 285. 1. The passive of this, *χρηματίζομαι*, means 'to receive an answer, to be informed, warned, or apprised;' see Acts x, 22. Heb. viii, 5. Here then we come to the meaning of the sacred writer. His words are to this effect: 'It happened that the council or government at Antioch decreed the disciples as Christians—held them forth—stigmatised them, by a public edict under the name of Christians.' Had the name originated with the disciples themselves, the Greek then would have been, not *χρηματίσαι*, but *χρηματίσασθαι*, 'and it came to pass that the disciples assumed to themselves the name of Christians, or called themselves Christians.'

If the followers of Christ were thus designated with hostile views, it must have been to distinguish them from those Jews who were enemies to Christ and his Gospel: and is it likely that the government should enter into the disputes of the Jews, and side with one party against the other while they equally despised both? In order to answer this question, I must here state what Luke has said in relation to this subject. 'Now they that were scattered abroad, upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phœnice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, speaking the word to none but to the Jews only. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a

great number believed and turned unto the Lord,' Acts xi, 20.—This same event is thus briefly related by Josephus in the seventh book of the Jewish War, c. iii. 3. 'The Jews at Antioch were continually bringing over a great multitude of the Greeks to their worship, and making them a part of themselves.' The historian then presently adds: 'Then a certain man named Antiochus, who was one of the Jews, and held by them in high estimation, principally on account of his father, for his father was a ruler of the Jews at Antioch, after having assembled the people, came to the theatre, and charged his own father and others with the design of burning the city in one night; and he delivered up to them certain foreign Jews as accomplices in this conspiracy.' These foreign Jews are said by Luke to have been men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who came to Antioch to preach the gospel.

Here we see the city of Antioch thrown into alarm and confusion by a violent dispute between the Jews. The inhabitants are assembled, a council is held, and Antiochus, a man in high estimation, charges the followers of Christ, among whom was his own father, with the diabolical design of setting fire to the city. By this means he ingratiates himself and his party with the people of Antioch, and causes a decree to pass branding their adversaries as incendiaries, and the followers of a crucified malefactor.

The pretence which Antiochus had for this cruel accusation, though not specified by Josephus, was probably the following: Jesus had foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, or more generally, that of *Antichrist*. The believers had no doubt of our Lord's prediction before they saw it accomplished. But it appears that some of them interpreted his language with an undue latitude, as implying the destruction by fire, not only of Jerusalem, but also of Rome, and the other great cities of the empire. 'The Sibyl,' says Lactantius, 'expressly declares Rome is to perish. Hystaspes also has recorded his wonderful dream, in which is represented a youth predicting that the Roman empire, and even the Roman name, would be crased from the world.' This opinion must have been held from the time in which Christ predicted the downfal of the Jewish state; and the actual accomplishment of that event gave it fresh strength and prevalence. The mistaken hopes of some among the believers might have led to the promulgation of it at Antioch; and thus it gave birth to the villainous accusation of An-

tiochus, not only against his innocent countrymen, but even against his own father, whose rank and virtues had procured him authority and consequence. This is a remarkable instance of the great enmity which the stubborn Jews cherished against such of their brethren as embraced the religion of Jesus, and strikingly illustrates the truth of his words, that he came to divide the father against the son, and the son against the father. It ought not to be omitted, that a very few years after this a similar event took place at Rome. Nero, it is well known, set fire to the city, and pointed to the Christians as authors of the crime. The accusation was plausible. That monster knew the sentiments of the early believers respecting the approaching conflagration of the capital: he set it on fire, and said that the followers of Christ did so to fulfil their own prediction. The imputation, first at Antioch, and then again at Rome, remote as these places were from each other, points to some one common cause, peculiar to the Christians, and serves to show that cause to be what I have here explained. It proves, at the same time, in opposition to Gibbon, the notoriety and prevalence of the Christian religion, even at this early period.

It is observable from the New Testament, that the followers of Christ among the Jews, never assumed the name of Christians. Neither the Apostle Paul, nor Peter, nor James, nor John, ever addressed the converts under this appellation. The reason is obvious: it was a term of reproach; it was a term invented by their enemies to brand them as heretics and incendiaries.

The same reason induced Philo and Josephus, who were Jews, and contemporary with the Apostles, to decline the use of the words *Christians* and *Christianity*, though in their voluminous writings they are historians and advocates of the Christians and their cause. In the ear of a Jew, Christianity sounded a frightful heresy. But these great and wise men considered it as the religion of Moses and the prophets, refined and sublimated by Jesus Christ. They speak of it therefore under those terms by which they designate the religion of their forefathers. In the above passage the Jewish historian calls it 'the worship' of the Jews, thus setting aside the charge of heresy implied in Christianity. The description of the preachers, as Jews, when bringing over the Greeks to their faith, is also levelled against the odious distinction inculcated by the title of *Christians*:

and holds up without an epithet Antiochus, seemingly the principal author of that name, as a monster and villain to the end of time.

ON THE INSEPARABLE NEGATIVE PARTICLE ΝΗ.

MUCH has been said lately on the subject of the particle Νῆ; and, particularly in the *Classical Journal*, V. xxvi, p. 162, there is a short article, in which the opinions of divers scholars are usefully brought together, and examined. It seems to me, however, that in the midst of a good deal of truth, there still remains some error as to the nature and origin of this particle. I will endeavor to give an explanation of it, which shall remove all difficulties, and reconcile all discordancies.

I perfectly agree with Dr. Blomfield that νηλεῶς is by an aphaeresis for ἀννηλεῶς, but a step beyond this I cannot go with him—I cannot consent with him to strike νῆ out of the Greek language, but must continue to consider it with Valckenaer as a privative particle, and as legitimate a word as any in the whole vocabulary, being both in force and form no other than the Latin *ne*, except only that νῆ in Greek is an inseparable particle, used only in compounds, while the Latin *ne* is used equally in compounds, and also substantively and independently.

The theory of Dr. Blomfield is plausible, as long as it is confined to the case where νῆ is used as a prefix to words beginning with a vowel. Thus νήνεμος may be supposed to be put for ἀνάνεμος, Ionice ἀνήνεμος. But what is to become of those compounds, where the principal word begins with a consonant, as νήπλεκτος from πλέκω, νηπαθής from πάσχω? Can it be believed, that these words were ever originally and at full length ἀνάπλεκτος, and ἀναπαθής? Νηπαθής and ἀπαθής are words of the same import, and equally in use, but ἀναπαθής, in the same sense, or in any sense, is a monster purely chimerical. Lobeck's notion, that the use of νῆ having obtained properly (i. e. by an aphaeresis) in the use of νήκεστος, νήνεμος, νήριθμος, its negative force became familiar to the ear, and was by degrees applied improperly to words beginning with a consonant, such as νήκερος, νηκερδής, νήποινος, is ingenious, and might be admitted, if no other way of solving the difficulty presented itself. Precisely in this man-

ner the French imitators of the Latin, finding *mentum* a very common termination in it, transferred this termination to their adverbs, and coined the very convenient but not very analogical class of words, such as *vainement*, *fortement*, *aucunement*, comment from *cum*, souvent from *sæpe*, &c.

Having stated my objections to the conjectures of others, I will now claim the liberty of advancing my own, and that is, that the *νή* in question is nothing more than an abbreviated form of *άνευ*. What has happened to many other words, that are constantly in our mouths, has happened to this; it has been maimed and mutilated both in its head and in its tail, and sometimes therefore it appears merely as *α*, as in *απαθής*, and sometimes as *νευ*, transformed into *νη*, as in *νηπαθής*. In like manner in our language we have made John by an apocope from *Johannes*, while the Dutch have derived their *Hans* from it by an aphæresis. It rarely, if ever, occurs in its full and proper form *άνευ*, when used as a privative prefix, but written as *άνη*, it is not unusual, as *άνηστis*, *άνηλεγής*, *άνηλειφος*, *άνηνεμος*, &c., and some of these words suffer an aphæresis, and then appear as *νήστis*, *νηλεγής*, &c. In the two last words, indeed, there is a double aphæresis, first of the prefix, and then of the principal word, as these, if written at full length, would be *άνήστis*, *άνηαλεγής*.

It is a confirmation of the preceding conjecture, that this very *άνευ* or *άνη* is preserved in the Latin dialect in the form of *sine*, and is made subservient to the same use in compounds, and is subjected even to more changes and metamorphoses. Like *άνη* it experiences an aphæresis, and becomes *ne* or *n* before a vowel, and like *άνη* it experiences sometimes an apocope, and becomes *sin*. It suffers also, what I believe *άνη* never suffers, that is, a syncope, and then becomes *se* or *s* before a vowel. I will give a few instances of each species of abbreviation; of the first in *negotium*, quasi *nevacatium*, *nemo*, quasi *nehomo*, *nudus*, quasi *neindutus*; of the second in *simplex*, *sincerus*, *inhumanus*, quasi *sinhumanus*, the borrowed aspirate *s* rejected; and of the third in *securus*, *sudus* quasi *seodus*, *surdus*, quasi *seauritus*, *sobrius*, quasi *seebrius*. Sometimes the *s* is dropt, as *edentulus* quasi *sedentulus*. I need hardly say, that this *se* negative is to be distinguished from the *se* intensive in *severus*, which is probably the Doric *ζα* for *δια*. Perhaps too *semis* belongs to this last *se*, and was originally *ζάμεσον* (i. e. *διάμεσον*, *dimidium*), whence, by a change of aspiration, we have also *ήμισυ*. Dropping the initial *s* we find *e* also for *se* intensive in *ebrius*, quasi *ebibus*, *edurus*, *egelidus*. But this by the way. •

Perhaps it may be expected that, as I assume *άνη* to be an

abbreviation of *ἄνευ*, I should give some other instances of this change of *ευ* into *ῆ*. In this manner we have from *εὐάνδρος*, *evander*, from *εὐάγγελος*, *evangelus*, and from *εὐοῖ εὐοῦ*, the digamma being inserted between the first and second syllables, as in *novus* from *νέος*. We have a farther instance of the conversion of *ευς* into *ῆς* in the proper names *Achilles*, *Ulysses*, &c., *Ἀχιλλεύς*, *Ὀδυσσεύς*. Perhaps too the imperfect *ἐτίθην* is regularly contracted from *ἐτίθεον*, *ἐπ'θουν*, *ἐτίθειν*, *ἐτίθην*.

I will just add, that if Dr. Blomfield had banished *νῶ* instead of *νῆ* from the Greek language, he should have had my full consent, and the more so because I believe it is this spurious particle *νῶ* that has bred the suspicion of *νῆ* being also spurious. It is evident, that *νώνυμος* and *ἀνώνυμος*, *νώδυνος* and *ἀνώδυνος*, are precisely the same words, with the difference only of an aphæresis, and it would be absurd therefore to assign to the same words a different etymology, to make *ἀνώνυμος* a compound of *ἀν* and *ὄνομα*, and *νώνυμος* a compound of *νῶ* and *ὄνομα*. It is equally evident too, that *νηλεὲς* and *ἀνηλεὲς*, *νήκεστος* and *ἀνήκεστος*, differ only in respect of an aphæresis, and therefore it was concluded by analogy, that if *ἀνηλεὲς* was compounded of *ἀν* and *ἐλεὲς*, *νηλεὲς* could not be otherwise compounded. But the analogy fails in this, that the supposed *νῶ* never is found but as a prefix to some word beginning with a vowel, and that vowel *ο*; whereas *νῆ* is found not only before the vowels *η*, *ε*, and *α*, but also before consonants, as *νηκερδὴς*, *νήλευστος*, &c. It is certain, therefore, that *νῆ* exists, as an inseparable particle, before many words beginning with a consonant, and it is probable, that it exists too as such wherever it is found before words beginning with a short vowel. Thus *νήκεστος*, *νηλεὲς*, *νήνεμος*, *νήγρετος*, &c. are quasi *νη-άκεστος*, *νη-ελεὲς*, *νη-άνεμος*, *νη-έγρετος*, and the full words without an aphæresis would be *ἀνη-άκεστος*, *ἀνη-ελεὲς*, &c. In all these instances, according to the common rule, *brevis initialis vocalis tollitur ante finalem longam*. Whenever the principal word begins with an *η*, I will surrender *νῆ* to the exterminating zeal of Dr. Blomfield, and spite of the respect I have for Hederick, Patrick, and my old masters, I must agree in thinking, that *ἀνήλιπος* and *νήλιπος* are better formed from *ἀν* and *ῆλιψ*, than from *ἀνη* or *νῆ* and *ῆλιψ*.

One word now at parting to Professor Dunbar. He remarks that *ἀνήκεστος* is *improperly* written for *ἀνάκεστος*, being compounded of *ἀ* privative and *ἀκέομαι*. The very same doubt was a source of perplexity to a grammarian quoted in Schæffer's edition of *Gregorius Corinthius*, p. 880. His words are these: *Ἀνηλεὲς ἄνθρωπος λέγεται μετὰ τοῦ ῆ, οὐκ ἀνελεὲς, καίτοι δοκεῖ*

ἀκόλουθον εἶναι μᾶλλον τὸ δεύτερον. But if I am right in my preceding conjecture, that ἀνῆ is the privative particle, and that ᾱ, ἄν, and νῆ are only abbreviations of the full form ἀνῆ, then both ἀνήκεστος and ἀνῆλες are very properly written, and as much so as ἀνάκεστος and ἀνελες would be, as both the rule of grammar and the law of pronunciation teach that the short vowel should give way to the long, rather than the long to the short vowel. If the Greeks had chosen to pronounce and write ἀνῆστρος, or νῆστρος, quasi ἀνῆ-στρος, as they did μή'στι for μή'εστι, instead of ἄναστρος, i. e. ἄν-αστρος, where would be the offence either against analogy or against reason? If the former mode of composition has prevailed in ἀνῆ-λες ἀνῆ-κεστος, &c., and the latter mode has been preferred in ἄν-αστρος, ἄν-ελπῖς, &c., it is chance and use that have determined this matter, and not design and ratiocination. Every language abounds in instances of this want of uniformity, and we are indebted to the irregularities of every language for one of its principal graces, that of variety.

I have now endeavored to make good my promise, and to prove that νῆ in Greek is as genuine a particle as *ve* in Latin, and that both are of the same origin, and perform the same office in compounds. If I have succeeded in defending νῆ, and in maintaining its right to a place in every Greek vocabulary, I have the satisfaction also of having defended from unmerited censure Valckenaer, and all the host of my good and dear friends, the ancient lexicographers and grammarians.

Oct. 1822.

J. B. M.

GREEK INSCRIPTIONS.

THE accompanying letter, which I have lately received from Mr Charles Otfried Müller, Professor of Antiquities at Göttingen, relates to an inscription in the Æolic dialect, which I copied at Turnavo in Thessaly, and which I published in the second volume of Mr. Walpole's collection of *Travels in the East*, p. 506. For the better understanding of Mr. Müller's letter, I here subjoin the inscription.

ΑΠΛΟΥΝΙΚΕΡΔ.ΙΟΥΣΟΥΣΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ
ΠΟΛΕΜΑΡΧΙΔΑΙΟΣΘΟΥΤΑΣ
ΟΝΕΘΕΙΚΕΙΕΡΟΜΝΑΜΟΝΕΙ
ΣΑΣΚΑΙΑΡΧΙΔΑΥΧΝΑΦΟΡΕΙΣΑΣ

If Mr. Müller is right in his interpretation of the last word, the inscription in common Greek will be as follows.

Ἀπόλλωνι Κερδῶος Σωσίπατρος
Πολεμαρχίδου ἱεροθύτης
ἀνέθηκε ἱερομνημονή-
σας καὶ ἀρχιδαφηφορήσας.

The other inscription from the same part of the country, alluded to by Mr. Müller, is as follows:

ΑΠΛΟΥΝΙΤΕΜΠΕΙΤΑ
ΑΙΣΧΥΛΙΣΣΑΤΥΡΟΙ
ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ

Ἀπόλλωνι Τεμπείτῃ Αἰσχυλὶς Σατύρου Ἐλευθέρια.

W. M. LEAKE.

MEMINISTI fortasse, vir præstantissime, quo die mihi tecum monumenta itinerum tuorum percurrere contigerat, sermonem inter nos incidisse in titulos illos Thessalicos, quorum alter inter Tempe et Larissam a te detectus a muliere quadam Ἀπλουνὶ Τεμπείτῃ, alter, quem in finibus Atracis reperisti, a viro ἀρχιδαφυφορεῖσασιν et ἱερομνημονεῖσασιν Ἀπλουνὶ obscure cognominato dedicatus est: atque, cum tu sententiam promeres, virum hunc, non quod Vv. Cl. Wapole et Dobree protulerunt, λυγιφόρον, sed δαφηφόρον fuisse, me pedibus in eam sententiam cucurrisse, quod ea mutatio non solum ad dialectum multo melius quadrare videretur, sed etiam ad sacra Græciæ, imprimisque Thessaliæ, cum nunquam fere lychnophoriarum in Apollinis religionibus mentio fieret, daphnephoriarum autem in ea regione magna fuerit celebritas; tum te ex me Parisios jam abeunte petiisse, ut litteris datis tibi quod ad manus haberem de Apolline Tempita et daphnephoriis hisce perscriberem, quod nunc eo libentius facio, quo magis eruditionis tuæ copia et sermonis suavitas animum meum admiratione et caritate devinxerunt. Jam igitur, si placet, oculos convertas in aram illam, in convallibus Tempeon ad Peneum albicantem Apollini antiquitus dedicatam, (v. Ælian. V. H. iii, 1.) cultoribus, puto, Doriensibus, quos olim has regiones tenuisse constat, et sacra Apollinaria per totam Græciam disseminasse, demonstrari potest. Hæc ea est, unde deus in marmore tuo Τεμπείτας audit. Haud longe distabat Pythium, templum et oppidulum in jugis Olympi, plus quam sexies mille sedes supra æquor situm (v. Plutarch. Æmilio), quod ego quidem omnium per Græciam Pythiorum facile antiquissimum puto. Aræ autem illi proxima erat laurus quædam vetustate nobilis, nomine obscuro (vel corrupto) Δυαρεία dicta, (Hesychius s. v.) unde theoria Delphi nono quoque anno huc missa ramum decerptum reportabat. Sed de hac theoria permitte ut sermonem altius repetam. Satis constat, totam fere Apollinis fabulam apud Delphos dramate quodam sacro propositam esse, de quo

multa docet Plutarchus de def. *διακ.* xiv. 21. quæst. gr. viii. 12. Puer patrimus et matrimus, e nobilibus Delphorum lectus, deum agebat cum Pythone pugnante, de eoque triumphante. Quibus peractis victorem cæde pollutum, ut ipsum olim Apollinem, ex-torrem fieri fas erat. Evadit igitur abique via, quæ *ἱερὰ* sive *Πυθίαις* dicitur, quam ex *Æliano* aliisque definire in promptu est. Descripta erat per fines Locrorum, Ozolarum, Doriensium, *Ænia-num*, Cætorum, Maliensium. Deinde via ad Pagasus deflectit, at-que lucum Apollinis Pagasitæ tangit, quod ex fragmenti *Ecæarum*, quod vulgo Hesiodi Scutum dicunt, ultimis versibus intelligi potest. Tum ad Pheras tendit, ubi puer pullatus et sordidus servitutem imitabatur, quam ipse quondam Apollo ex antiquo jure de homi-cidiis, ut sanguinem effusum expiaret, subierat. (Fabulæ antiquis-simam formam refert *Anexandrides* Delphus apud Schol. Eurip. Alc. pr. et Plutarchus.) Post hæc Tempe devenit theoria, ubi in cætu totius Thessaliæ (v. *Ælian.* l. l. et Plutarch. de def. or. 14. τοὺς ἔξω Ἡγλῶν πάντας Ἑλλήνας ἡ πόλις κατοργιάζουσα μέχρι Τεμπῶν ἐλήλακε) lustrationis cæremonis quibusdam ad aram illam perac-tis puer Apollinem agens, ramo de lauro decerpto, virginum choro jam lætiora Parthenia accinente, *Δαφνηφόρος* redibat. At cibum capere non ante licebat, quam *Deipnade*, in vico ad Larissam, quæ inde patet situm fuisse ad viam *Πυθιάδα* (*Stephan.* Byz. s. v. *Δειπνάς*). Hanc, quam definiimus, viam theoria per-agebat intra mensis spatium; septimo enim die mensis Bysii, qui Atticis est Munychion, pugna cum Pythone pugnata dicitur; at septimum Thargelionis, sicut Athenis et Deli, ita ad Tempe, diem lustrationis sanctissimum fuisse, probabile puto. Mittebant au-tem Delphi eam theoriam, ut dixi, *nono quoque anno*. Hæc inde periodus, quam Græci ennaeterida dicunt, magna in sacris Græciæ auctoritate celebrata est. Pythiadas antiquiores cum ludis musi-cis, quos bello Amphictyonum contra Cirrham multo priores esse constat, ennaetericas fuisse, docet *Demetrius Phalereus* (ap. Eust. ad Odyss. iii. p. 1466. Rom. Schol. Odyss. iii. v. 267. Maji). Ad eundem calculum Ismenia Thebanorum instituta erant, ut rela-tum habemus a Proclo apud Photium, eandemque periodum, quam olim *Censorino* teste Græci plerique *annum magnum* habe-bant, etiam aliis feriarum cyclis fundamento fuisse, nuper demons-travit *Bæckhius* in Commentario ad Pindari Olympia. Cum autem præcipue et a principio ad religiones Delphicas pertineat, atque ab isdem fere omnis lustrandi disciplina originem duxerit, intelli-gitur, quæ factum sit, ut eadem ennaeteris olim homicidis lustrari cupientibus, ut tempus pœnæ, exilii, servitutis definiretur, quod *Apollodorus*, qui eam κατ' ἐξοχὴν ἐνιαυτὸν dictam affirmat, et de Hercule et de Cadmo agens prodit. Sed hæc materiam satis lar-gam amplioris disputationis præbent; hic tantum posui, quæ osten-dere possint, quam antiqua, quam celebris, quam veneranda fuerit ea daphnephoria ad aram *Ἀπλουνοσ Τεμπεῖτα*. Atque omnem fere

Thessaliam in ea partes egisse, jam dixi, nec non cum cœtibus sacris publicam quandam civitatum ἀμφικτυονίαν junctam fuisse, Pylaicæ fortasse haud dissimilem, quanquam multo ignobiliorem, vestigia quædam monstrant ad tempora Romanorum usque servata (Livius xxxix, 24). Quam opinionem magnopere affirmari puto inscriptione tua, quæ eundem hominem Thessalum et ἀρχιδαφνηφόρον et ἱερομνήμονα fuisse ostendit, quod nomen in amphictyonia Pylarum satis celebre, et jam nullus dubito quin utrumque ejus munus ad sacra Τέμπων pertineat.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

No. xxxi.

Classical Criticism.

THE following emendation of a passage in Horace has little to recommend it on the score of elegance ; but as it proceeds from no ordinary source, and appears to have been hitherto unnoticed, I have been induced to transcribe it. It is cursorily introduced by H. Stephens in his Thesaurus, under the word Κεφαλή: "Sed et illud ipsum φίλη κεφαλή ad verbum expresse-
runt (Latini) Carum caput: ut Horat. 1. Carm. 14. Queis desiderio sit pudor aut modus Tam cari capitis, præcipe lugubres, etc. ita enim locum illum lego, non autem interrogative Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus Tam cari capitis? præcipe, etc. et intelligo Præcipe lugubres cantus queis, i. e. per quos, sit modus desiderio: qua de re obiter admoneri, non ingratum lectori fore putavi." Besides the extreme flatness of this commencement, there seems little propriety in applying to Melpomene for a remedy against excessive grief, and less probability that the remedy sought (*lugubres cantus*) would prove efficacious.

Under the same article on Κεφαλή, the following amusing digression deserves notice. Having discussed the expression ὡ μίαν ἀ κεφαλή, H. Stephens proceeds thus: "Hic vero mihi a risu temperare nequeo quum recordor Joachimi Perionii Benedictini Cormœriaceni, (viri monachice docti,) qui quum se Ciceronianæ eloquentiæ vicarium in vertendis celeberrimorum Græciæ Oratorum adversariis orationibus appellare non dubitasset, nactus mendosum exemplar (ut fit) orationis Æschinis in quo μικρὰ κεφαλή legebatur pro μίαν ἀ κεφαλή, minime illius exemplaris fidem suspectam habuit, (quum alioqui interpres alius vel

tantillo judicio præditus, et qui literas Græcas a limine saltem salutasset, non solum suspectam exemplaris fidem habiturus, sed eam prorsus illi derogaturus fuisset) quin potius hanc lectionem cupidissime arripiens, Demostheni parvum caput affinxit, ut videlicet Demosthenicum caput ad Thersiticum proxime accederet: si tamen Thersites *ῥυπάριος* simul et *μικροράριος* fuit. Hujus autem tam insignis erroris non meminisse, nisi lectores admonitos cuperem ut ab illius interpretationibus sibi caveant, utpote quæ aliis erroribus etiam multo gravioribus scatent."

Yet on this same Joachimus Perionius, of whom Stephens speaks thus contemptuously,* an eulogium is passed in a work intitled, "Pauli Jovii Novocomensis Episcopi Nucérini Elogia virorum bellica virtute illustrium, veris imaginibus supposita, quæ apud Musæum spectantur, in libros septem digesta. Doctorum item virorum ingenii monumentis illustrium ab Avorum memoria publicatis, altero tomo comprehensa. Basileæ 1571." P. 301. "Huic igitur (Joanni Bellaio) non immerito viri doctissimi morem gerent, benigneque docta ora pictoribus præbunt, ipseque ante alios Perionius, vel religionis amore sacratis inclusus septis, qui Aristotelem Ciceronis oreloquentem fecit, dum Strebæum, pari æmulatione conspicuum, glorioso certamine superare contendit." M.

EPIGRAMMATA, EPITAPHIA, VARIORUM.

No. 111.

Tumulus Mendici.

Nulla mihi vivo domus, at nunc certa sepulcro est :

Vitaque paupertas, mors mihi divitiæ.

Vita mihi exilium, requies at certa sepulcrum :

Nudus eram vivus, mortuus ecce tregor.

Judex corruptus.

Donabat Actor judici currum, dabat

Duos eidem equos Reus.

Pro se favor latæ siet ut sententiæ,

Ambo laborant munere.

Causa sed Actor cum cadit, dolens ait :

O currus, heu, quam devius !

Aliter nequit ; cum ducitur suis equis,

Refert disertus arbiter.

Infantis.

Quod potui vixi ; devixi triminis expers :
Dicta Sabina fui ; cetera non memini.

Erasmi.

Magnus Erasmus obit, quo non habuit prior ætas
Sed nec posterior est habitura parem.

Turnebi.

Turnebus jacet hic : quis sit si quærere pergis
Jam dignus es qui nescias.

In Zozimum.

Mercurio similem dicis te, Zozime, lingua :
Fallit te ratio, Zozime ; dic manibus.

In abeuntem amicam.

Aspexitque abiitque, et spicula sæva relinquens
Fraudavit votis brachia nostra suis.
Quid loquor, infelix ? solo si lumine vicit,
Quid faceret toto corpore diva tibi ?

In imaginem Jovis et Semeles.

Quis spirare Jovem neget hoc in marmore vivum ?
Marmore in hoc Semelen quis neget exanimem ?
Nil non consequitur veterum solertia, quando
Una animam artificis datque adimitque manus.

Ad Crispinum.

Calvus es et juvenis : laudo, Crispine, capillos,
Tam cito qui fatuum deseruere caput.

Ad Martianum.

Nil immundius est tuis libellis,
Et vis te tamen ut putemus esse
Numa Fabricioque sanctiorem.
Hæc sententia, Martiane, nostra est :

Quisquis versibus exprimit Catullum,
Raro moribus exprimit Catonem.

Ad Luciam.

Frigidius nihil est silice, et nil durius, illa
Semina flammæ sed tamen intus habet.
Frigidula et dura es, tamen hinc spes, Lucia, nobis
Scintillas aliquot corde latere tuo.

In Macrum.

Flet Macer, extincti sequitur dum funera fratris.
Tam pius est? inquis. Flet superesse duos.

In Molerium.

Plaudebat, Moleri, tibi plenis aula theatris,
Nunc eadem mœrens post tua fata gemit.
Si risum nobis movisses parcius olim,
Parcius, heu! lacrymis tingeret ora dolor.

In Deliam.

Aurea cæsaries, liquidaque argentea voce,
Delia, cur duro ferrea corde riges?

Vita fluit rivo similis.—OVID. MET.

Quid sit vita, et homo, vitæque volubilis hora,
Tum sciat, exiguum si quis conspexerit amnem,
Et varios nexus, et per sata læta volutos
Humores; et ubi jam cursibus unda citatis
Irruit Oceano tot vectigalibus aucta.
Tempus et unda simul pariter labuntur, et horæ
Arguit inde fugam, fuga non revocabilis undæ.
Labitur unda impulsæ unda, sequiturque priorem:
Truditur hora hora; sequitur pariterque fugatur.
Nonne vides ubi jam tenuis leve murmur in herba
Unda tenella ciet, vix et luctamine rauco
Tundit iter reboans lapidosum? hæc arguit ægras
Infantis lacrymas; hæc primæ limina vitæ:
Hæc tenera est ætas, tenuique simillima rivo.

Dein tamen ex herbis unda eluctatur, "eundoque
 Acquirat vires;" angustæque objice ripæ
 Frangitur indignans, et cursibus æstuat arctis.
 Ardor at hinc juvenisque vigor cognoscitur; hinc mens
 Frænorum impatiens: tum quis exæstuat iris.
 Sæpius ut saxis impingitur amnis eundo
 Præcipiti cursu, per saxa inopina volutus;
 Sæpius haud aliter vis tempestatis adortæ
 Obruit insolitis juvenes in fluctibus: iidem
 Sæpius exactos sero ingemuere labores.
 En ubi mox revolutus agris, alveoque patenti,
 Stat "placidus vento," et leni fluit agmine rivus,
 Neve hebetescit aquis, nec contra exæstuat ira.
 Hic vitæ Autumnus, posito fervore juventæ
 Maturus placidusque, inter juvenemque senemque,
 Nec senio fractus, nec concitus igne juventæ.
 Quod superest;—vastis jam vectigalibus auctus,
 Atque ægre luctans onerato rivus in alveo,
 Fertur ad Oceanum haud revocabilis amne citato;
 Obruiturque sinu vasto, rapiturque sub undas.
 Aspice jamque senem, curis senioque gravatum,
 Genua labascentem, atque informem tempora rugis.
 Ille puer juvenisque fuit: fuit optimus ævi
 Vir, juvenemque senemque inter: sed forma juventæ
 Transit; et exactis mediis quoque temporis annis,
 "Labitur occidua per iter declive senectæ."

Quisque suos patimur Manes.—Virg. *Æn.* vi. 743.

Perhaps some of your learned Correspondents, who have so ably resolved many very difficult passages in the Classics, will be kind enough to give their explanation of the above obscure one.—Scaliger says under this head—"Primo de mortuis intelligendum, ut quisque egerit in vita, ita et patitur mortuus; *Manes* dicitur anima hominis, cum ex corpore exiit: ita in vita etiam, ut quisque agit, ita a Diis punitur vel regitur—*Non placuit sensus ille, quisquis suos habet nævos.*"

Servius (in the 3d *Æneid*) thus defines *Manes*: "*Animæ sunt quæ, egressæ corporibus, nondum alia intrant corpora.*"—And Pomponius Mela in his book *de Situ Orbis*, Lib. i. cap. 9, informs us, that these *Manes* were worshipped by the *Augilæ*, a people of Libya.—"*Augilæ Manes tantum Deos putant; per eos dejerant, eos ut oracula consulunt, precatique, quæ volunt, ubi tumulis incubuere, pro responsis ferunt somnia.*"

It would be endless to enumerate the various meanings of the word *Manes* according to different authors : the difficulty is to fix on the precise acceptation in which the word is to be taken in the present case ; and it is this which I could wish to see resolved.

The best explication of the subject I have hitherto met with, is that given by Sanctius, Lib. iv. Cap. 16. “ Quemadmodum qui alios læserunt aut necaverunt, patiuntur Lemures et Larvas interfectorum, ut Orestes et alii ; sic Anchises et alii boni viri patiebantur proprios Manes, id est, non prius transibant ad Elysios, quam propria crimina purgarent. Et hanc interpretationem confirmant hæc Apuleii verba in 11. Florid. ‘ Brachmanæ Pythagoram docuerunt, quæ Diis Manibus pro merito suo cuique tormenta, vel præmia.’ ”

J. U.

Lines by Lord Holland to Lady Holland on the bequest¹ to her by Napoleon.

Hanc iterum egregiæ pietatis præmia gemman
Victori intacta misit ab urbe Pius :
Hanc tibi dat meritam Dux idem et captus et exul,
Quod sola es casus ausa levare suos.

Written under the portrait of Marshal Villars, who was named Hector.

Hic novus Hector adest, contra quem nullus Achilles.

Inscription over the Amphitheatre of Dissection at Toulouse.

Hic locus est ubi mors discit succurrere vitæ.

Albert Durer introduced Adam and Eve in one of his pictures, and painted them so beautiful and interesting, that the Poet Gaspard sent him the following distich :

Angelus, hos cernens, miratus dixit : ab horto
Non tam formosos vos ego depuleram.

¹ An antique cameo on the lid of a snuff-box, presented to Napoleon by Pope Pius vi. on his forbearing to take Rome, and signing the peace of Tolentino, in 1797.

*EURIPIDIS splendidum melos,—quo in primis delectabatur Porsonus, et ab ipso typis exscriptum, cum notulis ex Kiddii Porsonianis, p. 392.—Latine red-
ditum.*

Ἄ νεότας μοι φίλον ἄχ-
θος·¹ τὸ δὲ γῆρας αἰεὶ
βαρύτερον Αἴτνας σκοπέλων
ἐπὶ κρατὶ κεῖται,²
βλεφάρων σκοτεινὸν
φάρος ἐπικαλύψαν.
μή μοι μήτ' Ἀσιήτιδος
τυραννίδος ὄλβος εἴη,
μή χρυσοῦ δώματα πλήρη,
τᾶς ἥβας ἀντιλαβεῖν·
αἱ καλλίστα μὲν ἐν ὄλβῳ,
καλλίστα δ' ἐν πενίᾳ·
τὸ δὲ λυγρὸν φόνιόν τε γῆ-
ρας μισῶ· κατὰ κυμάτων δ'
ἔρροι, μηδέ ποτ' ὤφελεν
θνατῶν δώματα καὶ πόλεις
ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλὰ κατ' αἰθέρ' ἄ-
εὶ πτεροῖσι φορεῖσθω.

Εἰ δὲ θεοῖς ἦν ξύνεσις,
καὶ σοφία κατ' ἀνδρας,
δίδυμον ἂν ἦβαν ἔφερον,
φανερὸν χαρακτῆρ'
ἀρετῆς ὅσοις
μέτα· καὶ θανόντες
εἰς αὐγὰς³ πάλιν αἰλίου
δισσοῦς ἂν ἔβαν διαύλους·
αἱ δυσγένεια δ' ἀπλοῦν ἂν
εἶχε ζωᾶς στάδιον·⁴
καὶ τῶδ' ἦν τοῦς⁵ τε κακοὺς ἂν
γινῶναι, καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς·

1. Ne ἄχθος cum νεότας jungatur, legit Muretus, ἂ νεότας μοι φίλον· τὸ δὲ γῆρας ἄχθος αἰεὶ, quod metro nocet. Metro quidem convenienter et levi sane mutatione Musgravius, ἄχθος δὲ τὸ γῆρας αἰεὶ. Sed rationem reddere, quare vulgata lectio potius servanda videatur. [Rationem reddidit ipse vir summus Adverss. p. 271.]

[2. κεῖσθαι Aldus.—3. καὶ θνατοὶ ἐς τὰς αὐ. Ald. Emendavit Reiskius.—4. βιοτῶν

ἴσον ἄτ' ἐν νεφέλαισιν ἄσ-
τρων ναύταις ἀριθμὸς πέλει.
νῦν δ' οὐδεὶς ὄρος ἐκ θεῶν
χρηστοῖς οὐδὲ κακοῖς σαφές,
ἀλλ' ἐλιττόμενός τις αἰ-
ῶν πλοῦτον μόνον αὔξει.

Οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας
Μούσαις ξυγκαταμιγνύς,
ἀδίσταν ἐμζυγίαν·
μὴ ζῶην μετ' ἀμουσίας,⁶
αἰὶ δ' ἐν στεφάνοισιν εἶην.
ἔτι τοι γέρων ἀοιδὸς
κελαδεῖ μναμοσύναν.

Hercules Furens 637—679.

ΜΙΗΙ est Juventus pondus amabile ;
Mihi Senectus semper inhorret, ut
Ætnea rupes, et tenebris
Occupat impositis ocellos.
Non si refertis plena opibus domus,
Regale donum contigerit mihi,
Non atria Eoi tyranni
Barbarico cumulata luxu
Mutem juventâ:—divitiis tamen
Pulchra est, egenis pulchrior in malis
Juventa ; sed tristes Senectus
In maris atra abeat recessus !
Mortale nunquam debuerat Scelus,
Domos, Senecta, aut oppida visere—
Libramini ! virtutis æquo
Mens fuerat sapientis ævi
Cœlestē signum. Nos (animo licet
Pendere) morum participes viri
Forsan tulissemus, beati
Muneribus, duplicem juventam.
Nec nos iniquis sola comes malis
Jussisset atras visere regias,
Sed sola signasset nefandos
Degeneres Libitina fato !

Ald. σνάδιον Reisk. cujus nomen bis omittit Beckius.—5. Τῶδ' τοῦς—Ald. Emendavit Porsonus ad Med. 157.—6. ἢ et εἰμουσίας Ald. μή—ἀμ. Stobæus.]
Vide *Class. Journ.* No. XXII. p. 352. l. 12.

Discrimini esset moribus hoc bonis,
 Ut certa fulgent sidera navitis.—
 Volvenda nunc demonstrat ætas
 Dona, supervacuosque luxus.
 Sors molliori compede vinciat
 Mixtum Camœnis, me quoque Gratiis,
 Festisque versatum choreis:
 Degere nec pithara carentem
 Me sera cogant fata: senex adhuc
 Exacta vates gaudia concinit;
 Vitamque percurrens priorem
 In memores juvenescit annos.

R. TREVELYAN, A. M.

ON THE ANCIENT DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSE.

THERE is a mode of expression, very common among Classical authors, which I think has not been sufficiently noticed. When they spoke of the composition of bodies known to them, they considered them as containing *Four Elements*. This is well known, and continued in use till it was discovered that most, if not all, of those four elements are compounds. But when they spoke generally of the Universe, with reference rather to its grand divisions, than its component parts, they made but three divisions, *Heaven, Earth, and Sea*. These they called the *tria corpora* into which the whole is divided. Lucretius is clear upon the subject, in that magnificent passage, announcing the general dissolution of the whole, which every lover of Classical poetry admires and remembers:

Principio, *Maria*, ac *terras*, *calumque* fuere:
 Horum naturam *triplicem*, *tria corpora*, Memmi,
Tres species tam dissimiles, *tria talia* texta,
 Una dies dabit exitio, multosque per annos
 Sustentata, ruet moles ac machina mundi.

Lib. v. v. 93.

Ovid, who loved Lucretius, and often alluded to his words, has said of him, that his writings would not perish till that fatal day came:

Carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti,
 Exitio terras cum dabit *unus dies*.

Amor. i. 15, 23.

But the passage in his *Fasti*, where he more particularly

quotes Lucretius, on this subject, has never been understood, for want of recollecting this threefold division. All the Commentators, that I have seen, either leave it unexplained, or blunder about the elements, trying to account for his making them 3 instead of 4. Yet here he uses some of the most remarkable words of his predecessor, the *tria corpora* :

Post chaos, ut primum data sunt *tria corpora mundo*,
Inque novas species omne recessit opus.

Fasti, v. 11.

But if this was obscure, another passage of the same poet might explain it :

Explicat ut causas rapidi Lucretius ignis,
Casurumque *triplex* vaticinatur opus.

Tristia, ii. 425.

The very same threefold division is made by Ovid in the opening of the *Metamorphoses* :

Ante mare, et tellus, et quod tegit omnia *cælum*,
Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe,
• Quem dixere chaos.

Met. i.

What is that but a direct paraphrase of the *Post chaos*, &c. above cited ? Nor is this all : in another place he gives it in a different form :

Prima fuit rerum confusa sine ordine moles,
Unaque erat facies, sidera, terra, fretum.

De Art. Am. ii. 467.

In the passage of the *Fasti*, Ovid also disposes of his three parts, according to their nature :

Pondere terra suo subsedit, et æquora traxit,
At *cælum* levitas in loca summa tulit.

Fasti, v. 13.

The elegy to Livia, which some have ascribed to Pedo Albinovanus, but others, with more probability, to Ovid himself, speaks almost in the same words as Ovid :

Tendimus huc omnes, metam properamus ad unam,
Omnia sub leges mors vocat atra suas.
Ecce negem intentam *cælo*, *terraque*, *fretoque*,
Casurumque *triplex* vaticinatur opus.

v. 361.

Virgil makes the same distribution of things :

Aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum,
Terrasque, *tractusque maris*, *cælumque* profundum.

Ecl. iv. v. 50.

Again, when he speaks of the violence of the winds, he says that, if Æolus did not restrain them, they would carry the universe before them.

Ni faciat, maria, ac *terras*, *cælumque* profundum
Quippe ferant rapidi secum, verrantque per auras.

Æn. i. 58.

406 *On the Ancient Division of the Universe.*

The same partition is employed by the author of the poem on *Ætna*, now attributed to Lucilius Junior, but formerly to Cornelius Severus :

Diviso corpore mundi,

In maria, ac terras, ac sidera. v. 1008

Hence the common exclamation of "*O cœlam, O terra, O maria Neptuni*," as given to Demea in *Ter. Adelph.* v. 3. implies calling the whole universe to witness. Manilius, speaking of the governing mind of the universe, says :

Namque canam tacita naturam mente potentem
Infusumque deum cœlo, terrisque, fretoque,
Ingentem æquali moderantem scedere molem.

L. ii 59.

Prudentius, a very late poet, has retained the same idea :

Terra, calum, fossa Ponti, trina rerum machina.

De mirac. Christi.

Nor are we without authority from the Greeks. Aristophanes, when he describes the universe as arising from the operation of love, says,

Πρότερον δ' οὐκ ἦν γένος ἀθανάτων, πρὶν Ἐρως ξυνέμιξεν ἅπαντα,
Εὐμμιγνυμένων δ' ἑτέρων ἑτέροις, γένετ' οὐρανός τε, ὠκεανός τε,
Καὶ γῆ, πάντων τε Θεῶν μακάρων γένος ἄφθιτον.

Aves, v. 701.

That the illustration of this fact might be carried much further, I have not any doubt, but I have sent you what has occurred in my own reading, which seems to be amply sufficient to establish the usage which I have here remarked, and to prevent the future misinterpretation of some very poetical and luminous passages.

R. NARES.

NOTICE OF
CONSIDERATIONS *on the NATURE and TENDENCY of CLASSICAL LITERATURE, with remarks on the discipline at present pursued in the free Grammar school of King Charles II. at Bradford in the County of York.* By the Rev. Samuel Slack, M.A. Headmaster of the School, late Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford.

OUR readers, who are interested in the cause of liberal education, are acquainted with the able pamphlets lately published on the subject by Dr. Knox, and Dr. Butler of Shrewsbury.

This is a practical treatise on the same subject, the author of which is suffering from the illiberality of those, who misinterpret the literary foundations of Edward VI. We strongly recommend these strongly felt and elegantly written *Considerations* to the notice of the Scholar and the advocate for liberal education.

In works of learning we deprecate allusions to party politics. The *Epea Pterventa* lost much of its claim to universal admiration by the fondness of the learned writer for the introduction of his political opinions; and we should have been better pleased with the able writer of the present work, had he not thrust upon his readers a labored panegyric on a late Minister; for perhaps they will not all feel the "store of blessings, which he has procured to his country." Literature should soar above all party considerations.

SPECIMEN CHARACTERIS CODICIS AMBROSIANI

POSTEATARTUMPRISCUSADDIDITAL, ESCEN
ON SCRIPITPOSTPLACUITP opulodaddo fo nil, aspleb adseti dnu mcr f act is ujt b eia d o r e s p l e b e t r a i a n

PRO

SCAURO

LITUAETNA MAR
DEREDICUVSIC
VERREMO PERU
ISSEM SIC IAT
TETOTATU COP
RENDINA TITM
TESTEPROD VST
LTQUOTESD IN
MORTALESN ON
SATISQUODUO
NONQUODI NO
TONONQUOLE
UI

aputa ntigvoromn
utetiamex nom iniburum Et Enur au spian
aputro Confulfa Gul

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

IN THE PRESS.

Biblical, Oriental, and Classical Antiquities. By the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL. B. of St. John's College, and Rector of Blagdon, Somersetshire, vol. 1st, consisting of GENERAL PARALLELS.

Early in the year 1823 will be published, in two vols. 8vo., price to Subscribers 1*l.* 1*s.*, to Non-Subscribers 1*l.* 5*s.*, *A New Translation of the Tragedies of Sophocles.* By Thomas Dale, B. A. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Author of the Widow of Nain, Irad and Adah, &c. &c.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

In the course of the present month will be published Part II. of John Bohn's extensive bibliographical, analytical, and descriptive Catalogue of Books, comprising above sixty thousand volumes in all languages and departments of literature. The foreign philological and theological classes have been completed to the present time by recent importations.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Euripidis Electra; ad optimarum editionum fidem emendavit et Annotationibus in usum Juventutis instruxit HASTINGS ROBINSON, A. M. Coll. D. Joh. Cantab. Octo. 5*s.* 6*d.* •

This work has only just been put into our hands. We readily admit its utility in schools, and hope that a continuation of the Plays will soon render it equally serviceable to the more advanced student.

Ἀριστοτέλους. Aristæneti Epistolæ. Ad Fidem Cod. Vindob. recensuit, Merceri, Pauwii, Abreschii, Huetii, Lambecii, Bastii, aliorum Notis suisque instruxit Jo. Fr. Boissonade. Lutetia, 1822. 8vo.

By this new work Professor Boissonade has given an additional proof of his title to be considered one of the first Greek Scholars in France. Peculiar circumstances have prevented us from giving a full account of the Editor's labors in this number, but we hope to do justice to his present and past exertions on a future occasion, although we feel that no encomium of ours can add to the character which the Professor has obtained amongst the kind, the liberal, and the learned of Europe.

Φωτίου τοῦ Πατριάρχου Λέξεων Συναγωγή. E Codice Galeano descripsit Ricardus Porsonus. 2 Voll. 8vo. 1822. 1*l.* 10*s.*

After the lapse of more than thirty years, Porson's Photius has appeared under the *obstetrical* care of his friend and admirer, P. P. Dobree. Of his fitness for such works, whose least difficulty consists in the labor of execution, we have spoken freely, fully, and truly, in our notice of the Porsoni Aristophanica; and on the present occasion we have only to repeat our regret, that the Editor's feelings of reverence for the charac-

ter of Porson, have prevented him from giving us more frequent opportunities of seeing how naturally the names of the two scholars of Trinity College, Cambridge, are united in the heart and head of all lovers of Grecian Literature. A detailed account of the volumes will be given in our next.

Idylles de Théocrite traduites en vers Français par M. Servan de Sugny. Paris, 1822.

'Αριστοτέλους 'Ηθικά Νικομάχεια, ἐκδιδόντος καὶ διορθοῦντος Α. Κ. (the celebrated Dr. Coray) δαπάνη τῶν ἀναξίως δυσπραγησάντων Χίων. Paris, 1822. 8vo.

'Οησιάνδρου Στρατηγικὸς, καὶ Τυρταίου τὸ πρῶτον 'Ελεγεῖον, μετὰ τῆς Γαλλικῆς 'Εκατέρου μεταφράσεως, δαπάνη τῶν ἀναξίως δυσπραγησάντων Χίων (by the same editor.) Paris, 1822. 8vo.

Ovidii Metamorphoseon libros Græce a Maximo Planude redditos, e codd. Paris. edidit J. Fr. Boissonade. Paris, Typis Reg. 1822. 8vo.

Specimen literarium inaugurale exhibens Collectanea Euripidea, argumenti moralis et politici; quod, &c. &c. defendet Corn. Joh. Van der Palm, &c. Lugd. Batav. 4to.

Description (par M. Jomard) d'un étalon métrique, orné d'hieroglyphes, découvert dans les ruines de Memphis par les soins de M. Drovetti. Paris. 4to.

*Eclaircissemens sur un contrat de vente Egyptien en écriture grecque cursive, publié pour la première fois par M. Boeckh, avec une nouvelle copie du Papyrus d'après deux fac simile; par M. * * * * ** Paris, 1822. 4to.

BIBLICAL.

An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. By Thomas Hartwell Horne, M. A. Illustrated with numerous maps and fac-similes of Biblical MSS. Third Edition, corrected. In four large volumes 8vo. 3l. 3s.

Supplementary pages to the Second Edition of 'Mr. Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures,' so arranged as to be inserted in the volumes to which they respectively belong. With one new 4to. engraving, 8vo. 3s. A limited number printed.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Notice of Mr. Horne's new Edition arrived too late for our present Number.

Professor Gesenius' article will appear in our next.

VOL. XXVI.

Cl. Jl.

NO. LII.

2 D

410 *To Correspondents.—Advertisements.*

We shall, we trust, be able to attend to Professor Welcher's wishes.

The **DABISTAN** was printed at Calcutta in 1809. Should any gentleman have a copy to dispose of, a letter, addressed to X. Y. Z. Post Office, Cambridge, with particulars, will oblige.

[ADVERTISEMENTS.]

This day, 8vo. 16s.

PALÆOROMAICA,

OR HISTORICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL DISQUISITIONS; inquiring whether the Hellenistic Style is not Latin-Greek? whether the many New Words in the Elzevir Greek Testament are not formed from the Latin? and whether the Hypothesis, that the Greek Text of many Manuscripts of the New Testament is a Translation or Re-translation from the Latin, seems not to elucidate numerous Passages; to account for the different Recensions; and to explain many Phenomena hitherto inexplicable to Biblical Critics?

Printed for JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle-street.

This day is published, in 2 Vols. 8vo. price 24s.

DEMOSTHENIS OPERA OMNIA,

Gr. cum Scholiis, cura SCHÆFERI. On fine Paper 1l. 12s. The above form the first two Volumes of SCHÆFER'S DEMOSTHENES, GREEK AND LATIN, comprising his own Notes and those of TAYLOR, REISKE, WOLFF, and other Commentators, together with the "APPARATUS CRITICUS" of REISKE. The TEXT revised after BEKKER, HARLESS, RUDIGER and REISKE.

The price to Subscribers for the whole Work in 6 Volumes, is 10s. 6d. each Volume, common paper, and 14s. fine paper. A few copies on large paper, price 21s. per Volume.

The names of Subscribers are requested through their Booksellers, where Prospectuses may be seen.

Printed for BLACK, YOUNG, and YOUNG, Foreign Book-sellers, Tavistock Street, Covent Garden.

